











# CONTENTS

OF

Nº. II.



	PAGE
ART. I. 1. Scholia in Sophoclis Tragœdias Septem. E Codice MS. Laurentiano descripsit Petrus Elmsley, S.T.P. Oxonii e Typographico Clarendoniano.	
2. Sophoclis Tragœdiæ Septem, ad optimorum Exemplarium fidem, ac præcipue Codicis vetustissimi Florentini emendatæ, cum Annotatione tantum non integra Brunckii et Schæferi, et aliorum selecta. Accedunt deperditarum Tragœdiarum Fragmenta. . . . .	281
II. The Life of John Sharpe, D.D. Lord Archbishop of York, to which are added, select Original, and Copies of Original Papers, in Three Appendixes, collected from his Diary, Letters, and several other authentic Testimonies, by his Son, Thomas Sharpe, D.D. Archdeacon of Northumberland, Prebendary of York, Durham, and Southwell: Rector of Rothbury. Edited by Thomas Newcome, Rector of Shenley, Herts; and Vicar of Tottenham, Middlesex. . . . .	321
III. Critical Essays on Genesis, Ch. xx., and on St. Matthew, Ch. ii. 17. 18., with Notes. By the Rev. Charles Forster, B.D. Chancellor of Ardfer, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Limerick. . . . .	340

ART.	PAGE
IV. Cæsar and God ; a Sermon preached in the Parish Church of St. Martin, in Leicester, on Thursday, Sept. 21, 1826, before the Worshipful the Mayor and Corporation, previously to the Election of the Mayor for the Year ensuing. By Edward Thomas Vaughan, M.A. Vicar of St. Martin's, Leicester, and Rector of Foston, Leicestershire. . . . .	348
V. Sermons, chiefly designed to display the Connection between a sound faith and a holy Life. By the Rev. Edward Patteson, M.A. of East Sheen, Surrey ; formerly of Trinity College, Oxford. . . . .	358
VI. Reise in die Gegend zwischen Alexandrien und Parætium, die Libysche Wüste, Siwa, Egypten, Palästina, und Syrien, in den Jahren 1820 und 1821. Von Dr. Joh. Mart. Augustin Scholz, Professor der Theologie auf der Universitat zu Bonn. . . . .	362
VII. 1. A Friendly Address to the Episcopalians of Scotland, on Baptismal Regeneration ; showing that it is the doctrine of Scripture, of the earliest and purest Christian Antiquity, and of the Reformed Episcopal Church, as expressed in its Liturgy. By the Right Reverend Alexander Jolly, one of the Bishops in Scotland.	
2. A Charge, delivered on the 14th of June, 1826, to the Clergy of the Episcopal Communion of Ross and Argyle. By the Right Reverend David Low, LL.D. their Bishop.	
3. The Office of an Evangelist and Physician of the Soul : a Sermon, preached in the Episcopal Chapel at Stirling on Wednesday October the 18th, 1826, being the Festival of St. Luke, at the Ordination of the Reverend Samuel Heed. By the Reverend B. Bailey, M.A. Domestic Chaplain to the Right Honourable Lord Torphichen, and Minister of the Episcopal Chapel at Arbroath. . . . .	374

ART.	PAGE
VIII. The History of the Reign of Henry the Eighth: comprising the Political History of the Commencement of the English Reformation. By Sharon Turner, F.S.A. & R.A.S.L. . . . .	380
IX. Origines; or Remarks on the Origin of several Empires, States, and Cities. By the Right Honourable Sir William Drummond. . . . .	399
X. 1. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Stow, at the Visitation in May, 1826. By Henry Vincent Bayley, D.D. Archdeacon of Stow.	
2. The Principle of Ecclesiastical Order explained and enforced: a Sermon preached at a General Ordination in the Cathedral Church of Chester, on Sunday, July 9th, 1826. By the Rev. James J. Hornby, M.A. Rector of Winwick. . . . .	422
XI. The Expectations formed by the Assyrians, that a great Deliverer would appear, about the time of our Lord's Advent, demonstrated. . . . .	444
XII. Lux Renata: a Protestant's Epistle, with Notes. By the Author of Religio Clerici. . . . .	464
XIII. The Lord Mayor's Visit to Oxford, in the Month of July, 1826. Written at the desire of the Party, by the Chaplain to the Mayoralty. . . . .	473
XIV. A Sermon, preached in the Cathedral Church of Chester, on Sunday, November 5, 1826. By Edward Copleston, D.D. Dean of Chester, and Provost of Oriel College, Oxford. . . . .	482
XV. 1. Two Letters to the Right Rev. J. Milner, D.D. Bishop of Castabala, Vic. Ap. &c. Occasioned by certain Passages in his "End of Religious Controversy," By the Rev. T. H. Lowe, M.A. Vicar of Grimley, in the County of Worcester, and Chaplain to the Right Hon. Viscount Gage.	

2. A Letter to the Right Rev. John Milner, D.D. upon certain erroneous Statements, and incorrect Quotations affecting the Character of Eminent Divines of the Church of England, in a Book entitled "The End of Religious Controversy." By the Rev. John Garbett, M.A. Minister of St. George's, Birmingham. . . . 489
- XVI. A Sermon preached before the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts; at their Anniversary Meeting in the Parish Church of St. Mary-le-Bow, on Friday, February 15, 1827. By the Right Reverend Charles James, Lord Bishop of Chester. 493
- 

Law Proceedings relative to the Church—Special Bonds of Resignation. . . . .	497
State of the Dioceses in England and Wales. . . . .	535
Proceedings of the Universities. . . . .	545

THE

# BRITISH CRITIC,

## Quarterly Theological Review,

AND

### ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

---

APRIL, 1827.

---

ART. I.—1. *Scholia in Sophoclis Tragædias Septem.* E Codice MS. Laurentiano descripsit Petrus Elmsley, S.T.P. Oxonii e Typographeo Clarendoniano. 1825.

2. *Sophoclis Tragædiæ Septem, ad optimorum Exemplarium fidem, ac præcipue Codicis vetustissimi Florentini emendatæ, cum Annotatione tantum non integra Brunckii et Schæferi, et aliorum selecta. Accedunt deperditarum Tragædiarum Fragmenta.* Oxonii. 1826. 2 vols. 8vo.

THE first of the two works just mentioned recalls the name of a man whose memory will be revered as long as a surviving friend remains, and whose labours will be appreciated as long as learning is cultivated among us. It was the last, it was indeed the dying work of Dr. Elmsley; of whom, if of any person, it may be said with truth, *Multis ille bonis flebilis occidit*. The death of Dr. Elmsley has left that regret among his friends, which learning alone, if unaccompanied with warmer and finer feelings, could never have called forth. They lamented him as an accurate critic and a profound and elegant scholar; but they reflect with more painful sensations upon the charm of his conversation and the gentleness and goodness of his heart.

Dr. Elmsley was a man who won the affections of his friends, and conciliated the respect of all, more powerfully perhaps than any person whose reputation has been raised so high. Known as he was throughout Europe, and esteemed, if not the first, certainly among the first, of Greek scholars, he had neither the pride, nor the pedantry, nor the jealousy, which too often mark the characters of men who are otherwise great. To say that he was affable to all, would not express the manner in which he was ever willing to communicate knowledge. When he was con-



versing with an inferior, there was no appearance of condescension: he had the art of making all persons delight in his conversation, and without appearing to dictate or to monopolize discourse he was constantly referred to as authority upon every subject; and it seldom happened that he could not satisfy the inquirer. His memory was most surprizingly retentive; and fond as he was of examining into every subject, and possessing a delicacy and discrimination of taste which are not often combined with profound erudition, he was welcome every where as an amusing, as well as an instructive, companion. Nor let it be forgotten, that amidst his favourite pursuit of classical learning he had not neglected to draw from those living waters, of which he that drinketh shall never thirst. And those who can recollect when the same harmonious tones, which they had heard with delight in his social hours, were transferred to the House of God, and there employed in conjunction with his stores of knowledge and his elegance of style, will bear witness that the picture which has been attempted to be drawn, so far from being too highly coloured, falls sadly short of the worth and excellence of the original.

But we must confine ourselves at present to his labours in classical literature. Dr. Elmsley may truly be said to have been ἀπτιχώτατος; and as an editor of Greek Plays, he perhaps held the first place in combining critical rules with explanations of the author's meaning. It is observed by him, in his preface to the *Medea*, that the duty of an editor consists in two things; in correcting the text of the author, and interpreting his meaning. Of these two duties, he remarks that Porson executed the former so successfully, as to leave little hope of many improved readings being given; but as to the latter, with the exception of a few occasional and cursory remarks, he altogether neglected it. In the same preface he complains that this play, though so well deserving to have its beauties understood, had hitherto received very little illustration from any editor; and he continues:

“ I conceive therefore that my pains will be well bestowed, if I attempt what other persons have declined, and follow the same method in illustrating the *Medea* of Euripides, which Valcknaer and Markland pursued in editing three other of his plays: There is one thing however, which is allowed to all scholars who labour to advance critical learning, and which I hope will not be refused to me,—I mean, that I may take advantage of any passage in the poet which I am editing, to correct or explain other passages in his works or elsewhere, to propose new rules of construction or to confirm old ones, in short, to say whatever I please which is connected with this department, and which does not draw me off too far from the matter before me.”

In his preface to the *Heraclidæ* he explains another part of his system, in the following words:—

“ With respect to the notes, I shall perhaps receive some thanks from my readers for bringing together, and inserting in my annotations, whatever I found in Brodæus, Barnes, Heath, and Musgrave, which was likely to illustrate the play; and I conceive that the learned men, whose writings I have thus copied, would not think themselves ill-used, if I have not only omitted many of their erroneous interpretations and unfortunate conjectures, but have pruned and abridged some of their notes, which were in themselves extremely good, but rather too wordy for the taste of the present day. In some cases also, when they quoted from old writers, I have given the citations in rather an altered form, and have generally adopted the references to the pages and lines of the editions which I have used myself.”

Such were the rules which Dr. Elmsley followed in editing his Greek plays; and they seem to combine almost every thing which is wanted to render a commentary useful and instructive. The liberty which he claims, of saying any thing which he pleases, if he can give it a connexion with the passage before him, may evidently be abused, and may lead to endless digressions; but before we bring this objection, we should see whether the use which Dr. Elmsley makes of this privilege has led him into the fault just mentioned:—upon the whole, we think that it has not. We do not mean to say that his digressions are not sometimes too long, and his conclusions too hastily drawn—of which more hereafter; but the rule, when properly applied, is confessedly a good one; and if Dr. Elmsley should lead other critics, particularly those of our own country, to follow his example, he will have rendered an essential service to classical learning.

Our readers will perhaps not complain, if, previous to noticing the particular work before us, we give some account of Dr. Elmsley's critical labours; and we will now proceed to mention, in their order, the different editions of Greek plays which he published.

The earliest of his works of this kind was the *Achæarnenses* of Aristophanes, which was printed at Oxford in 1809. When Kuster published his edition of this author in 1710, he only added the readings of one MS. which was in the Vatican; and these were considered by Dr. Elmsley not to have been very important. Brunck consulted three MSS. in the King's Library at Paris for his edition, which appeared in 1783: one of these is supposed to be of considerable antiquity; but by far the most valuable MS. of Aristophanes was that which was preserved at Ravenna, and which unfortunately fell into the hands of Invernizius. This editor, who had before been a lawyer, not only

adopted many of Brūnck's conjectural readings and admitted them into the text, but with a scrupulous fidelity, as Elmsley quaintly observes, reprinted almost all the errors which Brūnck had inadvertently suffered to remain. Thus the excellence of the Ravenna MS. was materially diminished; at least it became extremely difficult to distinguish its real and peculiar readings. Dr. Elmsley endeavoured to remedy this defect; and this constitutes the principal merit of his edition. The notes are not so full of general criticism as those which he wrote later in life: they are printed under the text, except a few, which he called *Auctarium Annotationum*, which appear at the end. This book is now very scarce, and perhaps not to be bought; for not long after it had been published, Dr. Elmsley, for some reason or other, became dissatisfied with it, and called in all the copies which he could find.

In 1811 he published the *Œdipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles. He informs us in the preface, that his original intention had been to let his annotations hold a kind of middle place between the copiousness of Valcknaer and the brevity of Porson; but being disappointed in some materials which he had hoped to have possessed, (the nature of which he does not exactly explain,) he compressed his work into a smaller form than he had at first proposed. The only MSS. which he personally consulted, were three in the Bodleian library at Oxford, and one in that of Trinity College, Cambridge. He speaks of having examined about thirty editions of this play; and at the bottom of each page, in his own edition, he printed the various readings of six of them, which he considered to be the best; viz. those of Aldus, Junta (2d.), Turnebus, Stephens, Brūnck (3d.), and Erfurdt. His notes, which are more concise than to any other play which he published, are also at the bottom of the page. He gave notice, at the conclusion of the preface, of an intention to edit all the plays of Sophocles in the same manner; and the admirers of that poet, as well as every classical scholar, must deeply regret that he did not carry this project into effect.

In the year 1813 appeared at Oxford an edition of the *Heraclidæ* of Euripides. At the bottom of each page are printed the various readings of the Aldine edition, and of that edition only; and the learned editor stated, that every variation, not only of single letters but even of accents and spirits, had been noticed. The readings of other MSS. are mentioned in the notes. These annotations, which are printed at the end of the text, are extended to a greater length than any which he had hitherto published; and combining as they do the most valuable observations of former editors and a vast store of general criticism, they cannot be



read without great advantage, either as a commentary upon the play or as a separate work. Some additional notes are given as a supplement, which have been incorporated with the former ones in a reprint of this play, which was published by Dindorf, in 1821, at Leipsic.

The *Medea* of Euripides, which appeared in 1818, was edited much in the same manner with the *Heraclidæ*. Dr. Elmsley had published some of the notes in the *Museum Criticum*, in 1815; but in 1818 he republished them at Oxford, together with the text and several alterations and additions. The annotations are at the end; and those which are purely critical, and most unconnected with the immediate subject, are placed at the bottom of the page. The readings of the Aldine edition are printed under the text. Since the publication of the *Heraclidæ* Dr. Elmsley had visited Italy; and at Rome as well as at Florence he employed his time as might have been expected of so profound and accurate a scholar. In the preface to the *Medea* he gives an account of five MSS. containing this play, which he consulted in the Vatican. He considered the most valuable of these to be the one which he marked A, and which is probably of the twelfth century. It contains the seven first plays of Euripides, the *Troades*, and also the *Rhesus*: and our readers may judge of the industry and fidelity of Dr. Elmsley, when they learn that he twice collated this MS. with the Aldine edition of the *Medea*, and noted down all the various readings; at the same time he wishes it to be understood, that he did not collate all the five Vatican MSS. with the same care. The various readings of several other MSS. are also noticed in this edition; so that, in a critical point of view, the text of the play was exhibited in a much more perfect state than it had ever assumed before. This edition was reprinted at Leipsic in 1822 by Herman, who added at the end some annotations of his own, which had appeared in the *Classical Journal*, and some very useful indices.

The *Medea* was followed by the *Bacchæ*, which was published in 1821. This play also profited by Dr. Elmsley's foreign journey. He informs us in the preface, that he only knew of five MSS. being in existence which contained the *Bacchæ*,—one in the Vatican, two in the Laurentian library at Florence, and two in the King's library at Paris. Dr. Elmsley consulted all these MSS.; but he considerably reduces their value by stating, that the later of the two Florentine, and both the Paris MSS. are copies of the older Florentine; so that in fact there are only two original or independent MSS. of the play, and both of these are imperfect: it may be added, that neither of them is older than the fourteenth century. Still, however, scanty as this editorial supel-

lex must be considered, Dr. Elmsley has purified the text in no small degree; and he honestly professes that he ventured to think his own edition superior to any other. Many of the errors which the Aldine edition contained, and which it was hopeless to attempt to remove by conjecture, were corrected by means of the Roman and Florentine MSS.; but it is mortifying to find the learned and indefatigable editor acknowledging, after all his pains, that the hopes which he had once entertained were by no means realized, and that he had never undertaken any labour of that kind which turned out less satisfactory. The reason which he assigns is, that the play is full of such invincible difficulties and corruptions, that no learning or sagacity, unassisted by farther materials, could possibly surmount them. The notes, as usual, are critical and explanatory; they are printed under the text, with a few *addenda* at the end: and by way of appendix, we have a separate collation of the Aldine edition, and an unpublished life of Euripides, taken from a MS. in the Ambrosian library at Milan.

We mentioned, that when Dr. Elmsley published his edition of the *Œdipus Tyrannus*, he signified his intention of editing in succession all the plays of Sophocles. He probably did not entirely abandon this idea; and in 1823 he published the *Œdipus Coloneus*, with a more copious commentary than any which he had yet written upon the former plays. In the preface he mentions having made use of ten MSS. in preparing this edition; and we are perhaps to understand that he had collated the greater part of them himself. There can be little doubt that this was the case with four which were preserved at Florence; for since the publication of the *Bacchæ* he had again visited that place, as well as Rome. The play, with the notes, forms a volume of 368 pages; and he appears to have emptied his common-place-book more profusely than upon any other occasion; and perhaps there never was an edition of any author in which more pains were taken in enumerating the various readings, and settling the text.

The illness, which finally brought him to the grave, had already produced its effect upon the constitution and the energies of this highly-gifted scholar. For a time his favourite pursuits were almost suspended; and he lived only to superintend one more publication, which was a new edition of his *Œdipus Tyrannus*. The first appeared, as stated above, in 1811. It had subsequently been reprinted in Germany with considerable additions, both from the collations of MSS. and the notes of different scholars. Dr. Elmsley republished these additions in 1825, but he expressly states that there was nothing new of his own except what was contained in the preface. “*Quo minus annotationem poetæ*

verbis subjectam emendarem, obstitit adversa valetudo, qua diu laboravi. Postea vero quam Dei O. M. beneficio convalescere cepi, conatus sum graviores meos errores tollere." The piety of these words was as characteristic of Dr. Elmsley as the zeal with which he returned to his former labours. Though he states that this third edition contained nothing which was not in the first and second, except the preface, yet this alone gives a considerable value to the book, since it contains a collation of three MSS. in the Laurentian library at Florence. There are also at the end three very useful indices, which were added by the German editor; 1st, of the authors quoted, and 2d, of words which, in a critical point of view, contain any thing remarkable.

We have thus given a short and imperfect sketch of the different editions of Greek plays published by Dr. Elmsley. The fullest and most detailed review of his critical labours is that which was written by Herman, and appeared in Nos. XXXVIII, XLII, and XLIV, of the *Classical Journal*, and was republished by Herman himself, together with a conclusion of the critique, when Elmsley's *Medea* was reprinted at Leipsic. In this article there is a great mixture of praise and censure; nor are we disposed to say that the latter is in every instance unfounded. Herman gives great credit to Elmsley for his unwearied diligence and scrupulous accuracy in enumerating various readings: he also speaks in commendation of his minute grammatical knowledge, and confesses the value of many of his emendations. He adds, however, (and nearly the whole of the review is intended as a demonstration of the assertion,) that he cannot approve of the practice, so extravagantly pursued by Elmsley, of digressing from the subject before him, to discuss general topics of criticism or construction: he thinks that he was too fond of laying down grammatical canons, many of which are erroneous; and he charges him with venturing to correct passages in other authors without mature consideration. If we were called upon to give an opinion, we should have no hesitation in deciding, that an editor, particularly the editor of a Greek play, may with great advantage to his readers introduce general criticism into his notes. The limits to be put to this practice must necessarily vary; but when Herman lays it down as the sole and exclusive business of an editor to make his commentary turn upon the passage before him, and to confine himself to the explanation of that passage, we are decidedly at issue with him. The knowledge of a Porson or an Elmsley can only be obtained by a perusal of many contemporary writers; and if by editing a single Greek play these scholars can put their readers in possession of knowledge which they themselves acquired by studying several plays, such information is surely not to be with-

held. We would contend against Herman, or any critic of the German school, that no person, who makes pretensions to scholarship, should read a Greek play with the sole view of understanding the meaning of the words, or even the beauties of the poetry: at least, if he can pass over these best and purest models of Attic Greek, without wishing to know something of the rules of composition, he is not fit to read poetry at all. That Dr. Elmsley sometimes digressed too far from his subject, we are ready to allow; neither do we deny that he was rather too fond of generalizing and laying down rules, some of which, as Herman says, he would have wished afterwards to retract. But still this does not affect the principle for which we are contending. Of an hundred persons who read the *Œdipus Tyrannus*, or the *Medea*, perhaps only one would have the curiosity to compare it with other plays, or the talent or the memory to institute this comparison with effect: but when he meets with an observation or canon laid down by the editor, he may be able to see the force of it; and though he would not have discovered it himself, he may try the accuracy of it as he pursues his reading. It is thus that the notes of Dr. Elmsley are so interesting and useful, not only to the more advanced scholar, but to the first beginner. His mind seems to have been perpetually at work to dive into the principles of the Greek language; and his astonishing memory enabled him to accumulate and combine so many parallel instances, that he was always discovering some new rules which he fancied to have been followed by the Attic writers. This led him undoubtedly to make assertions which were hasty and unsupported: he has himself pointed out the errors of some of his own rules, and future critics will perhaps have to prove that others are untenable. But where much is attempted, some defects must necessarily appear. This critical legislation, if we may use the expression, was the peculiar characteristic of Elmsley; he has perhaps laid down more canons for the writing of Attic Greek than any other scholar; and we doubt whether Bentley himself has suggested more emendations of ancient authors.

The limits of the present article will not allow us to enter into a discussion of these canons; but it would be an essential service to criticism, if they could all be brought together into one view; and it may be interesting to our readers to know that, beside the editions enumerated above, Dr. Elmsley was the author of the following articles in different periodical publications. A review of Markland's *Supplices*, in the *Quarterly Review*, No. XIV.; of Wytttenbach's *Plutarch*, in the *Edinburgh Review*, No. III.; of Heyne's *Homer*, No. IV.; of Sweighæuser's *Athenæus*, No. V.; of Blomfield's *Prometheus*, No. XXXIII.; of Porson's *Hecuba*,



No. XXXVII.; *Classical Criticism*, in the *Classical Journal*, No. IX., p. 179; the same in No. X., p. 334, and in No. XI., p. 221; a *Dissertation upon the date of the Clouds of Aristophanes*, No. XI.; a *Review of Herman's Hercules Furens*, No. XV.; of *Herman's Supplices*, No. XVI., XVII.; *Notes on the Ajax*, in the *Museum Criticum*, No. III., IV.; a *Review of Porson's Medea*, No. V., of *Seidler's Iphigenia in Tauris*, No. VI., and of *Blomfield's Agamemnon*, No. VII.

We do not pretend to give this as a complete list of Dr. Elmsley's critical works; but we have reason to believe that the accuracy of it may be depended upon; and it may assist any person who would attempt the task, recommended above, of making an *Elmsleiana*, or a collection of Elmsley's critical canons. We may add, that the articles which he furnished for these different Reviews, are written in a strain of pleasantry and classical humour, which takes from them all the dryness and technical pedantry which are so common in works of that kind. It is impossible to read them without being highly amused: we would undertake to say, that no person will look through any one of them without smiling to himself; and when he has finished it, he will perhaps have picked up more information than he ever received from the same number of pages of the most learned and serious discussion.

Professor Herman has alarmed himself with thinking that the English nation was proceeding to pay the same homage to Elmsley which it had paid to Porson, and to receive his dicta as law with an obedience equally servile. But perhaps the cautions which he has given did not arise altogether from a love of literary freedom. It is well known that Porson derided Herman in no measured or qualified terms. The German had undoubtedly a right to feel angry; he was treated uncourteously, and we cannot say that he has spoken worse of Porson than might have been expected. But Elmsley also delivered his opinion of Herman in a manner which could not have been very pleasing to that scholar; and in a review of Herman's edition of the *Hercules Furens*, written by Elmsley, we may perhaps find a clue, to the tone of censure and disparagement in which the German critic speaks of long notes and rash emendations. It is there said, among other matters, that

“Mr. Herman is best known in England by his work on Greek and Latin metres; a book of which too much ill cannot easily be said, and which contains a smaller quantity of useful and solid information, in proportion to its bulk, than any elementary treatise, on any subject, which we remember to have seen.”

Again,—

“The edition of the *Hercules Furens*, which we have lately received,

has disappointed us. This disappointment indeed is in some measure our own fault. As we expected, without sufficient grounds, a volume of respectable size and thickness, we have certainly no just reason to be dissatisfied at receiving a thin and diminutive pamphlet. The editor of a Greek author has an undoubted right to make his commentary as concise and as jejune as he pleases, provided that he actually performs all that he professes to perform."

Now when this number of the *Classical Journal* arrived in Germany, it cannot be supposed that Professor Herman felt flattered; and since he could not complain of Elmsley for being "concise and jejune," he very naturally retorted upon him for being irrelevant and prolix. Elmsley also finds fault with Herman for so seldom correcting the text, and for taking no notice of emendations made by others. We have seen that Herman held Elmsley up to censure for erring in the opposite extreme. But it is impossible to read the pungent and galling sarcasm with which the English critic ridicules the antistrophic mania of the German school, without seeing at once that Herman must have felt extremely sore. Obstinate and self-complacent as he may have been, still he must have said to himself,

pudet hæc opprobria nobis  
Et dici potuisse et non potuisse refelli.

We are much mistaken, if many expressions in Herman's critique upon Elmsley may not be accounted for upon this principle of retaliation. It is somewhat singular that he caused it to be inserted in the very same journal, which had contained the reflections upon his own critical labours; and so scrupulous was he in attempting to neutralize the triumph of his reviewer, that since the articles written against himself extended through three numbers, he made his own review of the *Medea* divide into as many parts, καὶ τύπος ἀντίτυπος, καὶ πᾶν ἐπὶ πύματι κεῖται. We cannot however resist copying the following sentence, which closes the review written by Herman: every syllable of it gave us pleasure as we read it; and we could hardly have thought that any person could have done such justice to Dr. Elmsley's character, who had not known him intimately, and lived with him as a friend.

"Itaque tantum abest ut dissentiendo minuere laudem viri præstantissimi voluerimus, ut eum et ipsi valde admiremur, et dignum in primis putemus quem audiant omnes. Est enim P. Elmsleius, si quis alius, vir natus augendæ accuratiori Græcæ linguæ cognitioni, ut cujus eximia ac plane singularis in pervestigandis rebus grammaticis diligentia regatur præclaro ingenio, mente ab auctoritatibus libera, animo veri amantissimo, neque aut superbia, aut gloriæ studio, aut obtrectandi cupiditate præpedito. His ille virtutibus id est consequutus, ut, quum doctrinæ ejus

maximi facienda sit, non minus ipse sit amandus atque venerandus. Ea autem maxima est et non interitura laus, non utilem tantum, sed etiam bonum virum esse."

We have given above a list of the different critical works which Dr. Elmsley published in his life-time; but he was cut off by death in the midst of another work, which must always be considered of first-rate importance by the editors of Sophocles. When he was at Florence in 1820, he transcribed from a MS. in the Laurentian library, what are known by scholars under the name of the Roman Scholia, from having been first published at Rome in 1518. It is stated by Fabricius, (and copied probably from him by Harwood,) that an edition of Sophocles, together with the Scholia, was printed in this year. But the statement is certainly incorrect. The Scholia were printed by themselves; and the volume, independent of its contents, is deserving of notice, as being the second Greek book which issued from the press established in Rome under the auspices of Leo X. This munificent pontiff, however, has not the credit of being the first to establish a Greek press in Rome. The merit of this undertaking must be assigned to a private individual, Agostino Chigi, who invited Zach. Caliergus, a learned Cretan, to remove from Venice to Rome; and appointing him superintendent of a new press, he caused the works of Pindar to be published in 1515. This was the first Greek book printed in Rome. Greek types had been used in that city at an earlier period; for Sweynheim and Pannartz, in 1469, published an edition of Aulus Gellius, in which the Greek words that occur are printed in a fair character, without accents or spirits. But the merit of establishing a Greek press in Rome must be attributed, as stated above, to Agostino Chigi. The Pope soon followed his example. The Gymnasium, or Academy, which had existed before, was revived under his auspices; and John Lascar, who had been employed by Lorenzo de' Medici to collect MSS. in Greece, was invited by Leo to superintend a Greek press on the Monte Cavallo. The first work which was printed was the Scholia upon Homer, which appeared in 1517; and the Scholia upon Sophocles followed in the year after. The volume is a small quarto, with no printer's name—there is, in fact, no title-page; and it has sometimes been said that Caliergus was the printer. But this is probably a mistake. Caliergus, as stated above, was in the employment of Agostino Chigi; and it is well known that the press on the Monte Cavallo was under the superintendence of Lascar. It is to the latter scholar, therefore, that we must assign the publication of the Scholia upon Sophocles. They were taken from a MS. containing the works of that tragedian, which still exists in the Lauren-

tian library at Florence; and the fact of their being published at Rome, as well as of their being published at all without the plays to which they belong, can easily be explained. The *editio princeps* of Sophocles was printed by Aldus, in 1502, at Venice. John Lascar was then residing in that city. Aldus dedicated the book to him; and among other things he states, that the Scholia which had been lately discovered were not yet printed, but that, if God preserved his life, they should be printed very soon. Aldus died in 1515, and for some reason or other he never fulfilled his promise of printing the Scholia as a companion to his edition of Sophocles. It was therefore very natural that Lascar, as soon as he was established at Rome, should undertake the work; and the tragedies themselves being dedicated to him would make him still more interested in publishing the Scholia. Whether Aldus alluded to the Scholia which are contained in the Florentine MS. can perhaps never be ascertained. It is most probable that he did; but even if he did not, a pope of the Medici family would be likely to know the contents of the library at Florence, and Lascar would not lose much time in having the MS., as soon as he heard of its existence, brought to Rome.

Such is the history of the first publication of the Roman Scholia upon Sophocles. The learned have not yet succeeded, and probably never will succeed, in ascertaining who was the author of them. They have been ascribed, but without any foundation, to Sophocles the grammarian, Theo, and other persons; but all that can be stated concerning them is, that they form the oldest commentary upon this tragedian which is known to exist. The handwriting shows that they were not added by the person who transcribed the plays themselves; but those who are judges of these matters have given it as their opinion, that they were written about the same time. Almost every subsequent editor of Sophocles has reprinted these Scholia; and generally with many corrections, alterations, and interpolations. Not only the first edition of 1518, but the MS. itself, from which they were taken, contains many palpable errors and corruptions; from which it is plain, that they were not the observations of the person who transcribed them in the MS., but that they were taken from some older document, which was copied inaccurately. Most editors therefore have taken the liberty of correcting these mistakes according to their own conjectures: Scholia from other MSS. were not unfrequently incorporated with the first; so that nothing but a collation of every successive edition would enable us to detect the additions which had been made from time to time. Brunck was aware of the altered and interpolated state to which the Roman Scholia were reduced; and in his own edition of Sophocles, which ap-



peared in 1786, he had recourse to the original one of 1518, and, in many instances, he has corrected the errors very judiciously. Brunck was certainly deserving of praise for thus reverting to the original edition; but Dr. Elmsley has now proved, that the first publisher of the Scholia took as many liberties, in departing from his copy, as any of the numerous editors who have followed him; so that though Brunck has for the most part followed Lascar's edition, he has by no means printed the Scholia such as they appear in the Florence MS.

We are not aware that any scholar had taken the trouble of copying them from the original MS. since the time of their being first published. Dr. Elmsley, with that unwearied diligence which was so remarkable in him as being coupled with so much elegance of mind, accomplished this task; and the transcript which he made has been laid up, where, we trust, that it will for ever be preserved, in the Bodleian library at Oxford. The fruits of this labour have now been given to the world; and in the volume before us we possess the Roman Scholia in a much more perfect form than they have ever yet assumed in print. No one, indeed, who at all knew the accuracy of Dr. Elmsley, can doubt but that the printed book is as faithful a copy of the original MS. as could be ever expected to be made.

The short preface to this edition, which is written by Professor Gaisford, informs us of the circumstances under which it was published. Dr. Elmsley, upon his return to England, did not immediately prepare to print the Scholia. His health, which soon began rapidly to decline, made him still more unfit for such a troublesome office; and it was not till a few weeks before his death, when he enjoyed a short but delusive respite from his illness, and began again to apply to his favourite pursuits, that Mr. Gaisford renewed the subject of the Roman Scholia. It was important that they should at least be begun under his auspices; and with a most commendable zeal for the cause of literature, as well as from a sincere regard for his suffering friend, Mr. Gaisford undertook to correct the sheets himself, as they passed through the press. The offer was immediately accepted; the work was sent to the press without delay; and Dr. Elmsley, though then rapidly sinking, had the satisfaction to see some of the sheets completed before his death. When that melancholy event happened, about sixty-four pages were printed; and from thence to the end of the volume the whole care of superintending the edition was sustained by Mr. Gaisford. We have thus the greatest security for the work being faithfully and accurately performed. Seldom perhaps have two scholars of equal celebrity been united in the same task; and it is seldom also, that two men, so eminent in the

same department of literature, have lived in the same circle, not only without jealousy, but in habits of close and intimate friendship.

It might be expected from what has been said above, that this edition of the Scholia would differ very widely from all which have preceded it. We have also stated that the original MS. is by no means free from errors. Some of the Scholia are so abbreviated or corrupted as to be wholly unintelligible: in many cases it is easy to correct the grammatical blunders of the transcriber; but in others we must have recourse to conjecture alone in eliciting the true reading. The reader therefore is not to suppose, that the present edition is an exact copy, *verbatim* and *literatim*, of the Florence MS. To have printed it in this way would have been of little use, except to allow critical scholars to exercise their own ingenuity and sagacity. But the general readers of Sophocles will be much better pleased to find the text of the Scholia exhibited in that form, which at least presents an intelligible sense; grammatical errors are corrected; and where the writer, from ignorance or carelessness, put in a wrong word, another is substituted, which is either demonstrably the true one, or agrees with the context. In most cases the real reading of the MS. is given in a note; and the variations introduced by the Roman editor and by Brunck, as well as the peculiar readings of Triclinius, are also carefully marked. The collation of these various readings must have been a very tedious and laborious work: and without dwelling any longer upon the plan pursued by the editor, we will state one material benefit resulting from an examination having been made of the original MS. If we look to Brunck's edition of the Scholia, we find that every explanation of a passage has the words prefixed to it, printed in capital letters, which it professes to explain. Brunck informs us, that he had faithfully copied these words, which are placed at the head of each scholium, from the original edition of 1518; for since Lascar must have taken these words from the MS. in which the Scholia were written, by having them accurately copied from Lascar's edition we gain so many genuine readings of the Florence MS. All this sounds very well; and any person would imagine, that these *lemmata*, as they are called, which Brunck printed in capital letters, are *so many genuine readings of the Florence MS.* But Brunck might have spared himself this trouble. Dr. Elmsley's collation of the original MS. has made us acquainted with the fact, that the Roman editor did not always print these *lemmata* from the words which he found in the text, but often adopted other readings, either from conjecture, or which he has taken from other copies. Thus the conclusions of learned editors, who

have founded their interpretations or corrections of the text of Sophocles upon these lemmata, as supposing them to be taken from an ancient MS., are in some cases entirely destroyed. It appears that the Scholia have not always any lemmata prefixed to them, but the reader is to judge from the terms of the commentary to what particular words of the text it applies. In most cases this application is very evident; but sometimes it is not so easy to refer the Scholia to their proper place. In the edition now before us, a method is adopted of prefixing the lemmata, which prevents any misconception in this particular. Where they existed in the MS. the editor has separated them from the explanation by a colon : , but where he had to supply them from conjecture, he has placed a bracket ] immediately after them. In these latter instances the lemmata will frequently be found to differ from those which were printed by Lascaris and by Brunck; but as far as we have observed, these alterations have not been made without sufficient reason; and an inspection of the original MS. has naturally led to the removal of many errors, which could not have been detected while the Scholia were in their former corrupt and interpolated state.

From what has been said, it will appear plain that this edition of the Roman Scholia greatly excels every other in value. It is in fact the only faithful and accurate edition which ever has been made: for the first editor, as stated above, introduced many alterations of his own; and nearly all his successors have thought themselves at liberty to do the same. We do not however wish to deprive Brunck of the merit which is due to him. It must be acknowledged, that he published a much more critical edition of the Scholia than any person who had gone before him; and not having the original MS. to consult, he perhaps could not have done better. His corrections and substitutions are frequently very judicious, and in the present edition they are sometimes adopted in preference to the reading which was found in the MS. It appears also from Dr. Elmsley's transcript, that the Roman editor not only made alterations, but omitted several of the Scholia. In the present edition they are all faithfully restored; and there is scarcely a page in which the notes do not inform us of some of these omissions. It is true that in many cases the commentary is of little or no use; but no scholar would allow this to be a reason for not inserting them all; and in those instances where the lemmata are prefixed, it is very essential that they should be printed, because they give us the genuine reading of an ancient MS.

We will now produce some examples of the use which may be made of this edition in a critical point of view. If we were to give an account of all the errors which it corrects, and the new



scholia, which are now printed for the first time, we should have to transcribe the greater part of every page. We shall therefore confine ourselves to a few of the most striking instances, and particularly to those, where the mistakes and unfounded conjectures of the editors of Sophocles are exposed by an inspection of the authentic copy of the Scholia. The verses referred to in Dr. Elmsley's edition are the same as those in Brunck's.

#### ŒDIPUS TYRANNUS.

25. We have here an instance how one mistake leads to another. The Roman editor printed the Scholium upon the words φθίνονσα μέν κάλνξιν thus, σὺν τοῖς βλαστήμασιν, οὐ μόνον ἀφορίαν φησὶν εἶναι τῆς γῆς ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς πεφκώτας καρπούς διαφθείρεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ λοιμοῦ. The Florence edition of 1522 altered πεφκώτας into πεφνκώτας, which is adopted by Brunck. The true reading, which Elmsley has restored, is πεφνότηας.
46. The last words of the Scholium in Brunck's edition is εὖ διαγεγόναναι, but the true reading is ἐν εὐδία γεγόναναι.
287. The lemma in Brunck's edition is ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν ἀργοῖς, which is probably the true reading; but in the MS. it is ἐναργῶς, which has been altered to ἐν ἀργοῖς.
347. The lemma in Lascar's and Brunck's edition is ὅσον μὴ χερὶ, which might be quoted as a various reading; but in the MS. it is abbreviated, thus χ̅, which undoubtedly meant χερσὶ, as we find it in the text.
979. Lascar and Brunck read καλὸν τὸ ζῆν ἀλόγως, which conveys no meaning; the true reading is καλὸν τὸ ζῆν ἀσφαλῶς, which also is not very intelligible.
1062. Brunck reads τρίτον πεπραμένος καὶ αὐτὸς τρίπρατος. The true reading alters the sense very materially, and makes the expression much stronger, τρίτον πεπραμένης καὶ αὐτὸς τρίπρατος.
1321. The MS. has a Scholium, which is omitted by Brunck, and which contains a various reading, not noticed (we believe) in any edition: the words are γρ. καὶ ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ πόνοις, which is evidently a substitution for ἐμὸς ἐπίπολος.

#### ŒDIPUS COLONEUS.

84. The lemma in Lascar's and Brunck's editions is ὦ πότνι' ὦ δεινῶπες, which seems to be a various reading of ὦ πότνιαι δεινῶπες, and so it is printed in the text of the second Junta. But there is no foundation whatever for the reading: in the MS. there is no lemma at all, and the reading in the text is distinctly ὦ πότνιαι δεινῶπες.
98. The Scholium upon this verse is omitted by Lascar and Brunck; but it is of importance on account of the two readings, ὁδοιπόρων and ὁδοιπορῶν. The Scholiast evidently preferred the former: his words are οὐ γὰρ ἂν ποτε τῶν ἄλλων ὁδοιπορῶν πρώταις ὑμῖν ἀντέσχον, εἰ μὴ βούλησθε. The MS. originally read ὁδοιπορῶν, and though the former accent has been erased and the latter retained, it is evident that the Scholiast meant to read ὁδοιπόρων.

- 1 . We mention this instance to show how the carelessness of the Roman editor made nonsense of the passage: he printed the scholium thus, ἵνα μὴ πρὸς τούτους ὁ χάρος προπυθανομένους γένηται. Brunck made it a little better by reading προπυθα- νόμενος; but the MS. has ἵνα μὴ πρὸς τούτους προπυθανομένους ὁ λόγος γένηται.
153. We have here another instance of alterations and corruptions. Lascar printed εἰάν τις ἀγνοοῦντα τινὰ καὶ μὴ βαίνοντά τόπον ἄβατον—Brunck altered μὴ βαίνοντα to ἐμβαίνοντα. The true reading is *μαίνοντα*.
166. The Roman editor entirely omitted to mention that οἷσεις is given by the Scholiast as a various reading for ἔχεις. See Elmsley in his edition of the O. C.
238. Lascar and Brunck give γεραὸν ἢ ἀλαὸν as the lemma to the Scholium ἐκ τοῦ ἐπιθέτου νέει εἰς τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ὑπολογίαν, which makes nonsense. The Scholium evidently refers to ἀκόντων.
243. The lemma is distinctly οὐ κάλοϊς, and not οὐκ ἰλαοῖς as Brunck has printed it from the Roman edition.
443. Brunck explains ἔπος σμικροῦ χάριν to mean, that the sons of Œdipus would not exert themselves so much as to speak even a few words in his behalf. The Scholium upon the place, which is omitted by Lascar, and consequently by Brunck, remarkably confirms this interpretation, οἶον, ἀντιλογίας βραχείας ἔδει ποιήσασθαι αὐτοὺς ὑπὲρ τοῦ πατρὸς διωκομένου τῶν Θηβῶν.
837. We have here a striking instance of the liberty taken by the Roman editor in altering or omitting. Upon the word πόλει he printed this Scholium, ταῖς Ἀθήναις δηλονότι. But the MS. expressly reads, ταῖς Θήβαις, which shows that the writer of the Scholium meant to put this speech into the mouth of Creon. Reisigius had already proposed this alteration.
858. Here also the MS. reads ταῖς Θήβαις, which is altered by Lascar to ταῖς Ἀθήναις.
1077. Turnebus gives πολλὰ in the margin as a various reading for δεινά. There can be no doubt that he took this from the Roman edition of the Scholia, where the lemma is τὰν πολλὰ τλᾶσαν. But the MS. reads without any lemma τὴν πολλὰ δὲ ἀνατλᾶσαν, which Triclinius altered, not without reason, to τὴν πολλὰ δεινὰ τλᾶσαν. So that the various reading of Turnebus has no foundation whatever.
1173. We are obliged in fairness to notice this instance, because it shows the Scholiast to have been, as Elmsley observes, incredibly stupid. He connected the nominative πᾶσι οὐμός with the vocative ὦναξ, as appears from the Scholium, πρὸς τὸν Θησέα φησὶν ὧδε πᾶϊδα αὐτὸν κέκληκεν. The Roman editor, with more charity than fairness, omitted the latter part of the note.

## ANTIGONE.

140. Δεξιόσειρος, which is the lemma in the Roman edition, is probably right; the MS. reads δεξιόχειρος, as it does in the text;

but Elmsley considered this to have been a correction of the Scholiast, or of the person who added the Scholia.

264. The following sentence is omitted by the Roman editor, *τοῦτο μέχρι τῆς σήμερον οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι ποιοῦσιν Ἑλληνικῶς, πλανώμενοι καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις πλείστοις*. We cannot be surprised that Pope Leo's printer suppressed this passage.
316. Lascar and Brunck give *οὐκ οἶσθα καὶ νῦν* as the lemma: but it appears, as Elmsley observes, that the Scholiast meant to read *εἴσθα*, since his comment is, *ἄπιθι καὶ νῦν γὰρ λέγων ἀνιάρως μοι εἶ*. There is no lemma in the MS.

#### TRACHINÆ.

327. Lascar and Brunck printed the Scholium *ἔρημον, ὑψηλὴν, ἣν Ὅμηρος ἡνεμοέσσαν φησιν*. Hence Brunck proposed to read *ἡνεμέεσσόν* for *Οἰχαλιῶς* in II. β. 730, *οἱ τ' ἔχον Οἰχαλίην, πόλιν Εὐρύτου ἡνεμοέσσαν*. But the relative *ἣν* is not in the MS., and the Scholiast did not mean that Homer applied the epithet *ἡνεμόεσσαν* to Œchalia, but that the term *εἰρημον*, which is used by Sophocles, is the same with the Homeric word *ἡνεμόεσσαν*.
339. The lemma in the MS. is *τοῦ με τήνδ' ἐφίστασαι βάσιν*, and so Brunck printed it: but the Roman editor altered *με* into *κε*, upon the strength of which reading Porson (ad Phœn. 1373), proposed *τοῦ καὶ τήνδ' ἐφίστασαι βάσιν*; but as Gaisford well observes, "lectione codicis patefacta, corrui Porsoni emendatio."
497. We notice this, because it is said in the note that Lascar and Brunck omit the gloss *μέγα τι σθένουσα* for *μέγα τι σθένος ἅ*. But Brunck has the words in his edition, though he puts them at the beginning of the Scholium instead of at the end of it.

#### Αἶακ.

571. Brunck reads *μέχρις οὔ* instead of *μέχρις ἂν*, and quotes the authority of the Scholia; and in his own edition, as in the Roman, we find *μέχρις οὔ μυχούς κίχῳσι* as the lemma; but there is no such lemma in the MS.
579. Brunck observes that the false reading *καὶ δῶμ' ἀπάκτου* has been supported upon the authority of the old Scholiast, who gave *ἄπαγε* as his interpretation; but that this is an interpolation of Francinus, who superintended the second Junta edition of Sophocles. Brunck is however mistaken. The MS. it is true, does not contain the lemma *καὶ δῶμ' ἀπάκτου*, but it has the Scholium *κατὰ τῶν σκηνῶν ἄπαγε*.
1309. The Roman edition took no notice of *συνεμπόρους* being given as a various reading for *συγκειμένους*.

#### PHILOCTETES.

25. Elmsley's edition gives *κοινὰ δ' ἐξ ἀμφοῖν εἶη* as the lemma; but the remainder of the Scholium would lead us to suspect that *εἶη* is a mistake for *ἦη*, which is given by Brunck.

33. Brunck says "Scholiastes στιπτῇ habet, ut v. 2. ἄστιπτος." But this is not correct. In v. 2, the MS. has ἄστιπτος in the lemma, but at v. 32, there is no lemma at all.
180. It is incorrectly stated in this edition, that ἐνγενῶν is omitted by Brunck as a gloss upon πρωτογόνων.
351. Brunck observes that the words of the Scholiast are mutilated in this place; but he is mistaken; as he is in saying that ζῶντα is given as an explanation of ἄθαπτον. The fact is, that instead of the Scholium, which Brunck has printed, the MS. only contains the single word ζῶντα, meaning evidently to supply it after εἰδόμην.
425. Brunck misrepresents the Scholiast, when he quotes him as reading μόνος. There is no lemma in the MS., and the Scholiast decidedly gives the preference to γόνος.
493. Brunck says that the Scholiast reads παλαί' ἄν. He inferred this from the lemma in the Roman edition; but there is no such lemma in the MS.

We could have drawn out these remarks to a much greater length; but enough perhaps has been said to show, that no future editor of Sophocles can depend upon any edition of the Roman Scholia but the one now before us. We acknowledge, that a more close examination of the book has not increased our estimation of the old Scholiast: many of his interpretations are superfluous, and some of them childish; but at the same time the antiquity of the commentary gives to it a real value. The notes evidently were not the work of the person who wrote them in the Laurentian MS.: as we observed above, they were copied from some older document; and, consequently, whatever various readings they contain, are entitled to respect, as resting upon older authority than those of any existing MS. It is in a critical point of view, that the old Scholia are valuable; for as an explanation of the text, they are frequently deserving of contempt. We should add, however, that they supply a few historical fragments, as well as a few verses from the lost works of some Greek poets. A good and useful index of these fragments is added at the end of the present edition.

We must now notice the other work, the title of which is placed at the head of the present article. It is an edition of Sophocles, printed at Oxford, the execution of which does particular credit to the Clarendon Press. The first thing which attracted our attention upon opening the book, was a new type: and, if we are not mistaken, this is the first work printed at the Clarendon press, to which this new type has been applied. The character is rather larger than that which was before in use; and though it bears a considerable resemblance to the Porsonian type used at Cambridge, it has, to our eye, a more elegant and pleas-



ing form. When we look back to Wytttenbach's Plutarch, which issued from the same press not more than twenty-six years ago, and in which such extraordinary pains were taken to disfigure the page with ligatures and contractions, we rejoice in thinking that both our universities have at length entirely cast off these perplexing deformities. The art of printing is surely an improvement upon the art of writing: and to imitate in printing the contrivances which were adopted by men who wrote for their bread, and who studied abbreviations that they might save trouble and gain time, is a kind of retrograde process in literature; and upon the same principle we might take to print without points, and with no separations between the words, because the ancients followed this plan in their MSS. Every thing which expedites the passing of the eye from the beginning of a line to the end, must be pronounced a gain; and the more rapidly we can understand the words of a sentence without pausing to think of their construction, the more pleasure we shall find in reading. Upon this principle we should perhaps be at issue with those scholars who have almost succeeded in banishing accents and marks of every kind from Latin books. It is unscholar-like, we are told, to point out the ablative case by a peculiar mark: and it is insulting to suppose, that readers cannot distinguish the adverb *probe* from the vocative *probe*. But the fact is, that in this, which may be called the mechanical part of reading, the persons to be consulted are not the brilliant, but the stupid portion of mankind: and let a person be ever so learned, it must frequently happen that he is obliged to carry on his eye to the end of a sentence, before he can tell to what parts of speech the words at the beginning of it are to be assigned. This suspense might, in many cases, be avoided, if the printer was permitted to remedy the equivocations of the Latin language. But we must return to Sophocles.

The edition before us comprises more in two volumes than any other which has preceded it. The notes of Brunck are inserted almost entire, together with many from Schæfer, Erfurdt, and other modern critics. The passages from Suidas and Eustathius, which refer to Sophocles, are also added; and from the use which has been made of the best MSS. in preparing these quotations, we think we can trace the valuable hand of Professor Gaisford in lending some assistance to this edition. The work is certainly not unworthy of being prepared under his auspices; and we are happy in again finding the labours of his lamented friend, Dr. Elmsley, applied to the illustration of his favourite tragedian. The MSS. which were collated by that accurate scholar at Florence, Rome, and Naples, (the collations of which are now the property of the Clarendon Press,) have been made use of in the



present edition; and when, beside these various *subsidia*, we see the beauty and (as far as we have observed) the accuracy of the typography, we hail with particular pleasure the appearance of what may truly be called the first Variorum edition of a Greek tragedian.

Our readers, who are admirers of Sophocles, will perhaps not be displeased if, after having taken some pains in ascertaining the different editions and best MSS. of Sophocles, we lay before them, in as few words as we can, the result of our inquiries.

Whether the MSS. which were used by the earliest editors of Greek classics are still preserved, is a problem, which will perhaps never be satisfactorily solved. Of many of the works which were printed by Aldus, nothing certain is known concerning the copies from which they were taken. Hence the Aldine classics have a real value far beyond that which the anti-bibliomaniasts suppose them to possess. If the MSS. from which they were printed are now lost, the printed edition stands in the place of a MS. of the fifteenth or sixteenth century; and when we consider the quarters from which MSS. were brought in the time of Aldus, there is every reason to think that many of them must have been much more ancient. It was this which caused Dr. Elmsley, in most of his editions of Greek plays, to print a separate collation of the Aldine readings. Scholars are not agreed as to the MSS. which Aldus used in his edition of Sophocles. It has been observed that his edition of Euripides bears a considerable resemblance to the Vatican MS.; and since the same document also contains four plays of Sophocles, he would naturally consult it in editing both tragedians. But there is also reason for conjecturing that he used the best of the Florence MSS., or one from which that MS. was copied; since he speaks of intending shortly to publish some Scholia which had been lately discovered; and there can be little doubt that these were the same Scholia which we have described above. Whoever will take the trouble to compare the Aldine readings with those which Dr. Elmsley has given from the collation of the Laurentian MS., (Laur. A.), will find that, upon the whole, they have a striking affinity to each other.

Without attempting however to ascertain the libraries which were visited by the first editors of Sophocles, we will proceed to give an account of the best and most ancient MSS. of that author, which have hitherto been consulted; and we shall arrange them according to the countries in which they are to be found, beginning with Italy.

#### FLORENCE.

We give the first place to this city, because it contains the

oldest and most valuable of all the MSS. of Sophocles. Whoever wishes to acquaint himself with the stores of the Laurentian library, must consult the ponderous catalogue of Bandini; but Dr. Elmsley, in his edition of the *Œdipus Coloneus*, tells us nearly all that we want to know of it with reference to Sophocles. The Laurentian library contains two MSS. of Sophocles, mentioned by Elmsley, which he calls Laur. A. and Laur. B. The first of these is the oldest and best of any which is known to exist; and it is that which has been mentioned above as containing the Roman Scholia. Apollonius Rhodius, and the seven plays of *Æschylus*, are also in it. Bandini assigns it to the tenth century.

Laur. B. is very inferior to the former. Elmsley pronounces it to be full of faults, and frequently interpolated by the person who transcribed it. It was apparently written in the fourteenth century.

Bandini mentions several other MSS. of Sophocles in the Laurentian library; but none of them are older than the fourteenth century, and all of them probably belong to the same family with Laur. B. We need not therefore mention them in detail.

Dr. Elmsley also collated two MSS. of this tragedian in the Riccardi library at Florence. The first of them is the best, but is of no great value. It resembles a MS. in the King's Library at Paris, which Brunck called Par. A; but it is more modern, and not so correct. In the *Œdipus Coloneus* it has been\*observed to contain some of the peculiar Aldine readings; but the play is imperfect. Herman obtained some collations from it for the Chorusses of Sophocles. The second Riccardi MS. is extremely inaccurate.

#### ROME.

The Vatican MS. contains four plays of Sophocles, (the *Œdipus Coloneus*, *Antigone*, *Trachiniæ*, and *Philoctetes*,) thirteen of Euripides, (including the *Rhesus*,) and three of *Æschylus*. It agrees with the second of Brunck's Paris MSS., but is not so good. D'Orville had it collated for the *Œdipus Coloneus* and *Trachiniæ*, and his collation was published in the edition of Sophocles printed at Oxford in 1812; but Elmsley obtained a much better collation of it, which was made by Amati. The person who consulted it for D'Orville assigned it to the eleventh century; but Elmsley diminished its value very much by bringing it down as low as the fourteenth.

Dr. Elmsley also collated another Vatican MS., containing part of the *Ajax*, the *Antigone*, *Electra*, and *Œdipus Tyrannus*; but he inspected it very hastily, on account of the numerous errors and inaccuracies which it contains.

Herman, in his reprint of Erfurdt's *Œdipus Tyrannus*, mentions a *Codex Chigianus*, which probably exists in the library of the Chigi family, in Rome.

In No. XIV. of the *Classical Journal*, p. 428, there is a collection of various readings of two MSS., taken from the margin of an Aldine Sophocles. They appear to have been collected at Rome by John Livineius, an eminent critic of the sixteenth century, who assisted Canter in collating Greek MSS. at Rome, for the Antwerp Polyglott. Since Canter himself published an edition of Sophocles in 1579, it might be expected that he made some use of these collations. If we compare them with the readings quoted by Elmsley from the Vatican MSS., it seems most probable that Livineius himself took them from the Vatican.

## NAPLES.

Elmsley mentions one MS. at Naples, which formerly belonged to the Farnese library at Rome: but it is not a good one; it resembles that which Brunck called Par. T. but is not so correct.

## PARIS.

The King's Library at Paris is rich in MSS. of Sophocles. Brunck collected various readings from six, which had been collated before, but not accurately, by Musgrave. Elmsley informs us that Brunck's collation was also imperfect. The names by which they are generally known, are Par. A. B. C. D. E. and T. Of these Par. A. is considered the best: it contains the seven plays, and is probably of the thirteenth century. Par. B. is spoken of by Elmsley as a good MS., but it only contains four plays, the *Œdipus Tyrannus*, *Trachiniæ*, *Philoctetes*, and *Œdipus Coloneus*: it is not so old as Par. A, but has been supposed to contain readings of some grammarian who lived earlier than the thirteenth century. C. D. and E. are all of them more modern, and contain only three plays, the *Œdipus Tyrannus*, *Electra*, and *Ajax*. Par. T. contains all the seven plays; and, in the opinion of Elmsley, it is the MS. which Turnebus consulted, and from which the Triclinian recension has been so generally adopted by later editors. Brunck however considered Turnebus to have used, not this MS., but some other which was not so good. The fact probably was, that Turnebus made use of Par. T, but neglected some of its readings. However this may be, the value of the MS. is considerable, and it contains some readings peculiar to itself.

Of these Paris MSS. Elmsley collated A. B. and T, together with another which he calls F, and which Brunck did not see. Elmsley does not speak favourably of it; and it appears to be an indifferent copy of Laur. A. All these MSS., including F, were

also collated by Faehsius, and the readings were published by him in *Sylloge Lectionum Græcarum*.

Bekker also collated two MSS. at Paris, which we must suppose to be different from any of the former. Herman made use of the collations in his reprints of Erfurdt's plays; and for some reason, which he does not assign, he designated them by the name of Venet. The readings appear to agree with those of the Vatican MS., but the collation was not accurately made.

#### ENGLAND.

Elmsley, in his preface to the *Œdipus Tyrannus*, speaks of having consulted four MSS. of Sophocles in England, and gives it as his opinion that no more are to be found. He alluded to three in the Bodleian library at Oxford, and one in that of Trinity College, Cambridge. But there is a fourth in the Bodleian library, of which he takes no notice. Three of them contain only two plays, the *Ajax* and *Electra*: the fourth (which is marked *Laud.*) contains these two and also the *Œdipus Tyrannus*. All these four MSS. were collated for Johnson's edition of Sophocles, which appeared in 1705; and some Scholia, which are contained in them, were also printed at the same time. Burton either collated them afresh, or made use of Johnson's collation, for his *Pentalogia*; but Elmsley condemns the carelessness with which the readings are given. Erfurdt and Herman both made use of Burton's collation; but the MSS. were probably never so carefully inspected as by Elmsley.

The Cambridge MS. is said to resemble Laur. A.

There are also three MSS. in the British Museum (see *Class. Journal*, No. xxi. p. 91.) of which collations are given in Porson's *Adversaria*, p. 177, &c.

#### GERMANY.

The more recent editors of Sophocles have consulted several MSS. which exist in public libraries in Germany, of which no use had hitherto been made. None of them however appear to be older than the fourteenth century.

Leipsic contains two MSS. which resemble each other, and which are not on the Triclinian recension. Some account is given of them by Herman in his preface to the *Ajax*; and the various readings are added in the republication of Elmsley's *Œdipus Tyrannus*, which was printed at Leipsic. One of them contains only the *Ajax*, *Electra*, and *Œdipus Tyrannus*; and this is probably the case with the other.

Dresden also furnishes two MSS., which are stated to have been brought from Mount Athos. They both are upon the Triclinian recension, and contain the *Ajax*, *Electra*, *Œdipus*



Tyrannus, and Antigone. One of them is of the fourteenth century; the other of the fifteenth. They were consulted by Erfurdt.

Augsburgh contains two MSS. One of them, which has the Ajax, Antigone, Œdipus Tyrannus, and Electra, was collated by Schweighæuser for Brunck's edition. Erfurdt pronounces this collation to have been carelessly made; and he obtained a better for his own edition from Herman. The other MS. was also collated for Erfurdt's edition, and is stated to resemble that in the library of Trinity College: consequently it must be classed with Laur. A.

Jena contains one MS. of the Ajax and Electra. Erfurdt made use of it, and considered it of the fourteenth century. It is certainly not upon the Triclinian recension, but furnishes an additional proof that all the readings, which Brunck attributed to Triclinius, were not peculiar to him. An account of this MS. was published by Heusinger in 1745, and by Purgoldus in 1802.

#### MOSCOW.

Matthæi collated two MSS. at Moscow with Johnson's edition; and the collations are preserved in the library at Dresden. Erfurdt and Herman made use of them. One of them contains the Ajax, Electra, and Œdipus Tyrannus, and is of the fourteenth century; the other has only the two former plays, and is of the fifteenth century.

From the sketch thus briefly and (we are afraid) imperfectly given of the MSS. of Sophocles, it will be seen, that very few contain all the seven plays. We have not been able in each case to ascertain their exact contents. Florence and Paris certainly possess MSS. in which all the plays are written; and in this respect we conceive that these libraries stand alone. Our readers will perhaps have observed, that the Œdipus Tyrannus, Ajax, and Electra, were by far the most popular tragedies; at least in the enumeration given above, the two latter occur in fourteen MSS., and the Œdipus Tyrannus in ten; independent of those which contain all the plays. It is somewhat singular, that the arrangement of the plays in the early editions (we believe in all of them previous to that of Johnson) exactly followed the estimation in which they appear respectively to have been held by the readers of MSS. We find them arranged by Aldus and his successors in the following order: Ajax, Electra, Œdipus Tyrannus, Antigone, Trachiniæ, and Philoctetes; and this is precisely the precedence which would be given them, if we were guided by the number of MSS. in which each of them occur.

Elmsley speaks of Laur. A. and Par. A. B. T. as having been of great assistance to him. They are certainly the best of all the

MSS. of Sophocles; and with the exception of a few innovations, which perhaps every scribe introduced in a greater or less degree, nearly all the readings of other MSS. are to be found in some one of these four. The simplest division, which the MSS. of Sophocles admit of, is into those which follow the recension of Triclinius, and those which have nothing to do with it. We shall say more of this recension, when treating of the editions of Sophocles; and it is sufficient to state at present, that though what may be called the Triclinian MSS. are by far the most numerous, the others are the most valuable. Par. T. is to be placed at the head of those which follow Triclinius; but Laur. A., which leads the other division, is unquestionably the best.

When we proceed to class the editions of Sophocles, we must also make two of our divisions relate to the Triclinian recension. The editions of Sophocles should, in fact, be divided into three classes. The first would comprehend all that were printed between the times of Aldus and Turnebus, i.e. from 1502 to 1552: the second class would extend from 1552 to Brunck's edition in 1786; which would include what might be called the Triclinian age of Sophocles: and the third class would extend from Brunck's time to our own. It might perhaps not be incorrect to subdivide the second of these classes, and make Johnson's edition, which appeared in 1705, the commencement of a separate division. This edition made a new arrangement of the plays, and introduced some unpublished Scholia together with the readings of the Oxford MSS., and it has been republished several times in different places. But Johnson scarcely did enough for his author to have his book placed at the head of a new division; and Brunck may fairly be said to have produced a greater revolution among the editors of Sophocles, than any person since the time of Turnebus. The Brunckian age of Sophocles must perhaps be said in its turn to have come to an end, and the age of anarchy to have begun. Herman is himself looked upon as a demigod by the Germans, and neither Erfurdt nor Bothe have thought it necessary to adhere to the plan of any former editor. Elmsley has thrown such light upon Sophocles by the aid of his Italian collations, that the labours of Brunck are thrown considerably into the shade: and though the edition now before us professes to be constructed upon the basis of that of Brunck, yet the additional matter is fully equal to the former in value; and no future editor can ever think of reprinting Brunck's edition without incorporating some of the labours of later critics.

The editio princeps of Sophocles was printed at Venice in 1502, by Aldus, and was the first of the three Greek tragedians which issued from that celebrated press. It forms a small octavo

volume of 192 leaves, and the title page announces, that it was to be accompanied with some commentaries. These however never appeared. Aldus probably alluded to the Scholia which had been lately discovered, and which, in the dedication to John Lascar, he speaks of intending shortly to publish. He also mentions some materials for the better arrangement of the chorusses, which he hoped to print with the Scholia, and the absence of which had made his edition not so perfect in that respect as he could have wished. Lascar was at this time in Venice, as ambassador from Louis XII. to the Republic. We have already mentioned, that this formed the basis of all the editions till the time of Turnebus, and that the plays were arranged in the following order, Ajax, Electra, Œdipus Tyrannus, Antigone, Œdipus Coloneus, Trachiniæ, and Philoctetes.

1522. This edition is known by the name of the first Junta, having been printed at the press which then belonged to the heirs of Filippo Giunti, at Florence. The editor was Antonio Francini: and in the second Junta, which appeared in 1547, it is said, that great pains were taken in this first edition to remove even the smallest faults. The three first plays were stated to have received particular attention, and the readings of some old and valuable MSS. were collated. Since the publication of the Aldine edition, the Scholia had been published at Rome; and this was the first edition in which they appeared together with the text: but they were considerably interpolated with Scholia from other MSS.

1528. This edition was printed at Paris, in 8vo., by Simon Colinaens, without the Scholia. It is formed upon the Aldine edition, from which, according to Elmsley, it scarcely ever varies, except in the correction of typographical errors. Some copies have at the end three leaves which contain various readings taken from an old MS.

1534. This edition may be considered the first which contained any notes of the editor. It was printed at Hagenau (Haganoë) in octavo, under the direction of Joachim Camerarius. The family name of this celebrated scholar was Leibhard; but some of their ancestors having held the office of chamberlain at the Imperial court, they changed it to Cammermeister, which was Latinized into Camerarius. He was a Protestant, and attended the diet at Augsburg in 1530. In this edition the notes of Camerarius only extended to the Œdipus Tyrannus, Coloneus, and Antigone; but in 1556, he published at Basle a commentary upon all the tragedies of Sophocles. The Scholia accompanied the edition of 1534.

1543. If the account which we have seen is correct, the first



Latin translation of Sophocles was printed in this year at Venice, having been made by J. B. Gabia, of Verona: but never having seen the volume, we shall reserve what we have to say of the early Latin translations, till we come to the year 1548.

1544. This edition was printed at Frankfort, in large octavo, by Peter Brubachius, and contains the Scholia. It is said to follow the first Junta edition; and whoever examines it, will find a singular instance of disarrangement of numbers between pages 129 and 137, though the matter contained in the pages is all right. This edition was reprinted at Frankfort in 1550, 1555, and 1567.

1547. Florence. Junta: large 8vo. This is the second Junta edition, which has been much more referred to by scholars than the first. The printer was Bernardo Giunti, and the editor, P. Victorius. The preface speaks of excellent and ancient MSS. having been used, which enabled them to remove several errors and corruptions, particularly in the *Œdipus Tyrannus*, *Coloneus*, and *Trachiniæ*, as well as to add some Scholia. Dr. Elmsley however informs us, that an examination of the book by no means confirms these professions of improvement. The Aldine text was evidently the basis, from which this differs in about fifty places; but the typographical errors are so many, that sometimes it is difficult to distinguish them from intentional various readings. It is the opinion of Elmsley, that the editor made use of the Laurentian MS., which we have called A., and no other; but that he sometimes corrected the text from the Roman Scholia; and in other places his alterations agree with no known MS. whatever. The Roman Scholia are printed in the same page with the text.

1548. We have mentioned under the date 1543, that J. B. Gabia, of Verona, published a Latin translation of Sophocles in that year; but we have not been so fortunate as to see the volume. The translation cannot have excited much notice; for we afterwards find two other persons, G. Ratallerus, of Louvain, and Joannes Lalamantius, each of them putting forth what they called the first Latin translation of Sophocles. We have not seen the volume which Ratallerus printed in 1548; but from a second edition, which he published in 1576, we learn, that in 1548 a translation of three tragedies of Sophocles had been printed by him at Leyden; and in the second edition, which contained all the seven plays, he mentions the year in which some of the translations were composed: thus the *Ajax* was translated in 1548, the *Antigone* in 1549, the *Œdipus Coloneus* in 1552, the *Trachiniæ* and *Philoctetes* in 1553. The reason is plain, why the dates are given with this precision. In 1557, J. Lalamantius, a



physician of Autun, published at Paris, what he termed the *first* Latin translation of Sophocles: and in the preface to the second edition of Ratallerus's translation it is asserted, that Lalamantius borrowed very largely from Ratallerus, even so much as to copy whole pages. Ratallerus therefore affixed the dates to his own translations, that his claim to being the first translator might thus be demonstrated. The question, in fact, can admit of no dispute. Ratallerus certainly printed his first edition at Leyden before Lalamantius published his translation at Paris; and it is equally certain, that Lalamantius borrowed from Ratallerus, though he does occasionally mention his name. We have dwelt longer than we intended upon this point, because it is interesting to ascertain who were the earliest translators of Sophocles into Latin; and the order of priority seems to have been as follows:—

1543. J. B. Gabia, Venice.

1548. G. Ratallerus, Leyden, three plays.

1557. J. Lalamantius, Paris.

1576. G. Ratallerus, second edition.

1584. ————— third edition.

1550. This was a reprint, in small octavo, of the Frankfort edition, without the Scholia. See above at 1544.

1553. Paris. Turnebi. 4to. This is the edition which began a new æra in the history of Sophocles. Up to this time all former editors had followed Aldus, with only a few deviations from his text: but henceforth the edition of Turnebus was held in such high estimation, that Stephens and Canter and other great scholars thought it unlawful to depart from it. Brunck has abused Turnebus as being unfit for the office which he undertook; and certainly the changes which he introduced must be considered, on the whole, to have been very unfortunate; but Brunck was rather too severe in his censure. The history of Turnebus and his editorial labours is briefly this. He was a native of France, though Scotland puts in a claim to him, and asserts that his family name *Tournebæuf* was nothing more than *Turnbull*, and that he was the son of a Scotch gentleman, who settled in Normandy. Be this as it may, he was considered to be a most profound Greek scholar in his day, and combined the two offices, which have not often been united in the same person, of king's printer and king's professor of Greek. Among other learned works he brought out an edition of Sophocles in 1553. In the copy which we have seen, the date at the end is 1552, but in the title page 1553, which probably led Harwood into the error of naming two different editions. We believe, that in some copies the date in the title page is also 1552. He informs us himself, that he had possession of a MS. given him by Cæmarus

Ranconetus, which contained the tragedies of Sophocles, arranged, corrected, and commented upon by Triclinius. Of this Triclinius little is known. He was a monk of the 14th century, and wrote Scholia upon the text and the metres of Sophocles. If he did not introduce many arbitrary alterations of his own (for which he seems hardly to have been competent) the copies which he used must have differed very materially from those which were consulted by Aldus and his successors: hence the Triclinian recension has been adopted as the name of a certain class or family of MSS. The order of the plays is however the same. It was the fashion formerly to accuse Triclinius of having altered the text of Sophocles without any authority: but it has been proved by Elmsley and other critics, that many of his peculiar readings are contained in MSS. which are older than the time of Triclinius. Laur. A., for instance, agrees with some of them. Elmsley was of opinion, that the MS. which Turnebus used was that which Brunck called T. in the king's library at Paris: he also introduced some readings which are peculiar to Par. B. The Scholia upon Sophocles were also considerably augmented from the Triclinian MS., for it contained some which were totally different from the Roman; and henceforward the distinction was adopted of old and new Scholia. Turnebus printed both; and he is charged by Stephens with having sent them out full of errors: he observes also that the Scholia, which Turnebus published upon the three last plays under the name of Triclinius, had been edited before. In this edition some various readings are noted in the margin.

1555. The Frankfort edition was printed a third time in this year. See above at 1544 and 1550.

1558. Fabricius mentions an edition printed by Turnebus in this year at Paris without the Scholia. We have not seen a copy of it.

1558. In this same year another Latin translation was published at Basle, which is the last that we shall notice. The author was Thomas Naageorgius. The book also contained annotations; and we mention it, because it was much sought for in its day on account of these notes. Naageorgius was a satirical writer against the court of Rome, and published *Regnum Papiasticum*, and other similar works.

1567. A fourth edition was printed this year at Frankfort: and since the editor of this, of which we have seen a copy, was the same who had edited the first, viz. Peter Brubachius, we may suppose that he also superintended the second and third editions. See above at 1544, 1550, 1555.

1568. Paris. H. Stephani, 4to. In the preceding year Stephens

had printed a small volume called *Tragædiæ selectæ Æschyli, Sophoclis et Euripidis*, which contained of Sophocles the Ajax, Electra, and Antigone in Greek, and also translations of them by Ratallerus. In the present year he printed an edition of all the plays of Sophocles. It was formed on the basis of Turnebus, and contains the new and old Scholia, which Stephens professes to have printed much more accurately. It is plain that he was extremely pleased with this edition: for he had already edited Æschylus in such a manner, that he considered little more remained to be done, and yet the following distich appears in the title-page of his Sophocles:

“ Æschylon edideram, Sophocles invidit, at idem,  
Cur ab eo posthac inuideatur, habet.”

The title-page also announced that his annotations upon Sophocles and Euripides would be published in that same year. We have already mentioned that the commentary of Camerarius upon all the seven plays had been printed at Basle in 1556. This commentary was added by Stephens to his own edition. The great fame of Stephens has gained him more credit for the benefit conferred by him upon Sophocles than he appears to deserve. Elmsley considered the text to be not so good as that which Turnebus printed: he conceived also that Stephens had consulted but few former editions, and no new MSS.; and the annotations, which were published separately in that same year, do not contain much which is of any value.

1578. Fabricius mentions an edition of Sophocles published this year at Wittenberg by Mat. Welaccus.

1579. Antverpiæ. Canteri. 8vo. This volume forms one of a set of the Tragedians, printed at the press of Christopher Plantin; but it is a small and ugly book. William Canter, the editor, was a native of Utrecht, and died at the early age of thirty-three. He altered the text of Stephens in a few places, and professed to have done a great deal towards arranging the chorusses in a better and clearer manner. We cannot however see that he did much beyond placing the words *ιαμβοὶ, ἀνάπαιστοι, ἀντιστροφικά*, &c. in their respective places. He also added some notes, which he took principally from Stephens; but they do not occupy more than seven pages in all.

1585. Fabricius mentions another edition printed in this year at Wittenberg. See above at 1578.

1593. It is always said that Canter's edition was reprinted in this year at Leydén. We have compared the two copies, and certainly there are some marks which would seem to point out two separate editions. But the contents of each page exactly



agree in both; and at the end of what is called the second edition, there is the same notice which was printed in the first, "*Antverpiæ excudebat Christophorus Plantinus Architypographus Regius Anno MDLXXX.*"

1597. This is also a republication of Canter's edition made at Heidelberg, and printed by Commelin. It is called Canter's edition, because it contained his notes, and the chorusses were arranged upon his plan: but there was also added a literal Latin translation, made by Vitus Winsemius, which is printed on the opposite page to the Greek; and this is the first edition which contained a version of the text arranged in this way.

We have thus seen that the sixteenth century furnished seventeen editions of Sophocles, beside the Latin translations, which were published separately; and there may perhaps be others which we have omitted. The following century was not nearly so prolific, for in the whole course of it we have not heard of more than four different editions.

1603. Paul Stephens printed an edition in 4to. this year, and Geneva is generally mentioned as the place of publication. The copy which we have seen has no mention of any place, and this probably has led some persons to say that it was printed at Paris. The text is taken from H. Stephens's edition of 1568; but each page contains, below the text, the Latin translation made by Winsemius. The new and old Scholia are also printed at the top and bottom of the page. At the end are the metrical Scholia of Triclinius, the annotations of H. Stephens, and the commentary of Camerarius: so that this volume, though not much noticed by later critics, comprised nearly everything that had hitherto been done for the illustration of Sophocles.

1608. We find notice of an edition in 8vo., printed at Ingolstadt with the Scholia, but we have not seen a copy of it.

1614. It may be mentioned also that the plays of Sophocles will be found in the first volume of a *Corpus Poetarum Græcorum*, printed in folio at Geneva in this year.

1665. Cantabrigiæ, 8vo. We are not able to give any detailed account of an edition said to be printed at Cambridge in this year, with a Latin version, and all the Scholia. Some copies are stated to have the date of 1673.

1705-8. The eighteenth century was ushered in with a new edition of Sophocles, which long bore a considerable character, and has been often reprinted. We mean that of Johnson. The first volume was published at Oxford in 1705, and the second in 1708: the third, which was printed in London, did not appear till 1746, making in all a complete edition in three volumes 8vo. Our readers will have observed, that through the course of the seven-

teenth century little or nothing was done toward throwing new light upon the tragedies of Sophocles. Turnebus was in fact the last editor, of whom we can say with certainty, that he made use of any new MSS. The praise therefore which was bestowed upon Johnson's edition, was not given without reason. Thomas Johnson does not appear to have been a man of any remarkable attainments; but he was diligent and accurate; and if his own country had furnished more materials, he would probably have availed himself of them. He was a native of Oxfordshire, and educated at Cambridge. The only MSS. which he consulted, were the four which are now in the Bodleian: but three of these only contain the *Ajax* and *Electra*, and the fourth, in addition to those two plays, has the *Œdipus Tyrannus*. Accordingly we find no various readings in Johnson's edition, except in these three plays. He added however some unpublished Scholia from the Oxford MSS.: he reprinted the Roman, or old Scholia, as well as those of Triclinius; he composed a new Latin translation, and added some notes. These notes are but few: in the first and second volumes they appear to have been Johnson's own; but in the third they are mostly selected from other editors. The first volume contains the *Ajax* and *Electra*; the second has the *Antigone* and *Trachiniæ*; the third has the *Œdipus Tyrannus*, *Philoctetes* and *Œdipus Coloneus*.

1722. In this year a small edition was published in two volumes 12mo. containing the Scholia. The editor was Michael Maittaire, who was well known at that period for several classical works. It has been said that the preface was written by Tonson: but Tonson disowned it.

1745. Johnson's edition was reprinted at Glasgow by Foulis, in one volume 4to. and two volumes 8vo. The latter edition is said to be extremely inaccurate.

1746-7. Elmsley, in his preface to the *Œd. Tyrannus*, speaks of an anonymous edition of Sophocles published in London in 1746, and in his preface to the *Œd. Coloneus* he mentions another, likewise anonymous, published in 1747. We conceive that he meant the same edition, which consisted of two duodecimo volumes, in which not only the text of Stephens, but nearly all his typographical errors were faithfully copied.

1758. Johnson's edition was reprinted in London by Bowyer, in two volumes 8vo. Bowyer however only superintended the *Ajax*, *Electra*, *Trachiniæ*, and *Antigone*; and in preparing the two first of these plays he had the assistance of Palairet. Vauvilliers states, in the preface to his own edition of 1781, that Johnson's was reprinted in London exactly in the same form, and so precisely similar, that even the typographical errors were the



same, and every little defect or failure of the press might be traced in both, and yet that they were certainly two different editions. We imagine Vauvilliers to have alluded to this reprint of 1758; but not having seen a copy of it, we have not been able to compare it with the original edition of 1705.

1774. This also is a reprint of Johnson's edition, in two volumes 8vo., published at Eton. The editor was J. Tweedie.

1781. Paris, Capperonneri, two volumes 4to. The first preparations for this edition were made by John Capperonnier, professor of Greek, and librarian to the king of France; but upon his death in 1777 the work was carried on by John Francis Vauvilliers, who succeeded him as professor. He printed all the Scholia, including those of Johnson, which he corrected in several places; and made some alterations in the Latin translation, and added some notes as well as an index. In a critical point of view, Vauvilliers did little or nothing for the text, having been prevented from consulting the MSS. in the king's library, which Brunck had just obtained permission to carry to Strasburg. Brunck published a volume in 1779, containing the *Œdipus Tyrannus* and *Electra* of Sophocles, and the *Andromache* of Euripides. Vauvilliers had the opportunity of seeing this volume before his own edition of Sophocles came out; and he states in his preface, that Brunck had anticipated him in many conjectures. The notes are not numerous, and, on the whole, the edition is more remarkable for the beauty of its appearance than any real addition which it makes to the elucidation of Sophocles.

1786. Argentorati. Brunckii. 4to and 8vo. 2 vols. We are now arrived at what we fixed as the third era in the history of the editions of Sophocles. The Triclinian recension had been followed by every editor since the year 1552; and with the exception of Johnson, in 1705, no person had consulted any new MSS. Richard Francis Philip Brunck, who was born at Strasburg in 1729, and who applied himself to Greek literature as an amusement, undertook an edition of Sophocles upon an entirely new plan. He saw the defects which Turnebus had been the means of introducing into the text; and in the censures which he passes upon Triclinius he perhaps goes a little too far; but we must always be greatly indebted to him for recurring once more to the Aldine readings, which had been so long neglected. He tells us that he made the Aldine edition the basis of his own, and that he never departed from it without acquainting his reader with the fact. His principal merit however, and that which justly entitles him to stand at the head of a new school, is the collation of MSS. In order to ascertain the true readings of the text, he consulted eight MSS., of which we have already given some account; six were in the King's library at Paris, one came from Augsburg, and

one belonged to himself. By the help of these MSS., and sometimes by his own conjectures, he reduced the text to a much greater state of purity than it had hitherto assumed. He added a Latin translation, which is inconvenient to refer to, from not having the verses marked by the side. His notes are more critical than explanatory; and he speaks of having received some observations of Tyrwhitt and Hubert Van Eldik. The arrangement of the plays was altered by him; and he was the first editor who took the trouble of making a verbal index of *Sophocles*. This index, though by no means perfect, and in some respects inconvenient, is a great advantage to every reader. The edition was followed, in 1789, by a third volume, containing the *Scholia*. Brunck was well aware of the numerous interpolations which the *Scholia* had received; and we have already mentioned that he thought to restore them to their purity by following the Roman edition of 1518. With this view he printed the Roman *Scholia* by themselves; which were followed by other *Scholia*, taken from former editions or from MSS.; and lastly, he printed the *Scholia* of Triclinius, omitting those which concern the metres, as being trifling and useless. This third volume also contains the fragments of *Sophocles*, which no former editor had collected; and a lexicon of those *Sophoclean* words which are quoted by the old grammarians. Our readers will have perceived by this hasty sketch, that the benefits rendered to *Sophocles* by Brunck were important, and the original matter which his edition contains is considerable. He was perhaps not a profound scholar, and his collation of MSS. may not have been made with great care; but the example which he so spiritedly set has been ably followed; and experience has shown, that the critical apparatus which he collected for *Sophocles* has materially abridged the labours of all subsequent editors.

1786. The same year which saw Brunck's edition issue from the press, also called forth another, which was printed at Eton in quarto. The superior merit of Brunck's edition has thrown this into the shade; but as a critical work it was well deserving of notice. The Greek text was said to be corrected by Harwood; at the end of which are some short notes, and then a most copious and excellent index by Morell; various readings are also added, from the editions of Aldus and Turnebus; so that, in the same year, two editions, in two very distant places, agreed in the propriety of recurring once more to the Aldine edition.

1789. In this year Brunck again printed his edition, in three volumes octavo; but the impression did not extend beyond 250 copies. Some new notes were added, the text was occasionally altered, more liberties were taken in correcting the Roman *Scholia*, and those of Triclinius were omitted.

1800. Oxonii. 2 vols. 8vo. This edition was prepared from the papers which Musgrave left behind him at his death. Dr. Samuel Musgrave was a physician at Exeter, and after having taken part in political disputes in 1761, distinguished himself by an edition of Euripides and other classical works. He had made considerable preparations for publishing Sophocles, and some time before his death he caused a sheet to be printed, which contained the text according to Johnson's edition, and his own notes below. He died in 1782; and in 1800 the Delegates of the Clarendon Press caused his papers which were prepared for this edition to be published. It is evident that the work was not left by him in a finished state; but he had been at great pains in collating former editions, and his notes, though containing many very improbable conjectures, are useful to the student, and display considerable acquaintance with the classics. It does not appear that he had consulted any new MSS. There was found among his papers an index of the passages of Sophocles which are quoted by Suidas; and this is printed in the second volume. The persons who superintended the edition have also thrown in some very useful additions. Between the text and the notes the various readings are marked of the Aldine edition, both the Florentine, and those of Colinæus, Turnebus, and Brunck; in which respect this edition possesses an advantage over every one that preceded it. The fragments of the lost plays are added from Brunck's edition, and the index is also taken from the same; but upon comparing them, we observe that several words were introduced which Brunck had not noticed, so that the index in Musgrave's edition is better than that of Brunck. The Scholia were afterwards printed at Oxford, to match this edition.

1802-11. The editor who has taken the most pains with Sophocles, since the time of Brunck, is Erfurdt; but he died before the work which he had undertaken was completed. His intention was to publish each play separately, in quarto and octavo, so that each would occupy a volume. To make his edition more perfect, he consulted six MSS., of which only two had been collated before. Two of these MSS. came from Dresden, two from Augsburg, one from Jena, and one from Moscow. One of the Augsburg MSS. had been collated imperfectly by Brunck, and the various readings of the Jena MS. had been twice published; the rest were new. Erfurdt also received annotations from many German scholars, particularly Herman, whose talents and assistance he rated very highly. Under the text he printed various readings from Aldus, Brubachius, Turnebus, H. Stephens, Canter, and Brunck; but he states that he had not seen either of the Junta editions. He printed the old Scholia from the first edition of 1518, copying even the errors, to which he added all the other



Scholia which Brunck had printed. Erfurdt lived to publish six of the plays, which appeared in the following order:—1802, the *Trachiniæ*; 1803, *Electra*; 1805, *Philoctetes*; 1806, *Antigone*; 1809, *Œdipus Tyrannus*; 1811, *Ajax*. He gave notice of intending to publish a lexicon of Sophocles, and a very full verbal index. It is to be regretted that he did not live to complete this part of his plan, since he gave proofs of great industry in his collection of various readings, and of much learning as well as judgment in his notes, which are by far the most copious of any which have yet appeared upon Sophocles. In 1825 a seventh volume was published, containing the *Œdipus Coloneus*, which was edited, on the same plan, by Heller and Doederlein: and since Erfurdt's death, Herman has printed an abridgment of his edition, in seven volumes duodecimo, some of which have already gone to a second edition.

1806. Lipsiæ. Bothii. 2 vols. 8vo. This edition is not much known in England, nor is it desirable that it should, if Elmsley's account of Bothe be correct, that he surpassed all the editors of all the poets in the rashness and exuberance of his criticism, and scarcely left any passage of Sophocles unaltered. The edition contains a Latin version, all Brunck's notes as well as those of other scholars, a lexicon *Sophocleum*, and an index.

1808. Brunck's edition has been often reprinted in England. The present edition was printed at Oxford, by Bliss, in two volumes octavo.

1812. Another edition was printed at Oxford, by Parker and Bliss, in three volumes octavo, which was taken from the third edition published by Brunck in 1789.

1816. The *Classical Journal* for this year announces an edition of Sophocles, in two volumes quarto, to be published at Leipsic, by Beck. It contains a Latin version, the old Scholia and those of Triclinius, selections from the notes of Stephens, Johnson, Heath, Brunck, Musgrave, &c. and Beck himself. We have never seen this edition; but, from the known industry of Beck, it is likely to be an useful work, though not perhaps bearing marks of deep erudition or original genius.

1819. London. 3 vols. 8vo. Priestley. This is not merely a reprint of Brunck's edition; but besides every thing which that editor contributed, it contains a selection of the various readings from Erfurdt's edition, and some unpublished notes of Dr. C. Burney.

1820. Oxford. 3 vols. 8vo. Parker and Bliss. This is also a reprint of Brunck, with additions, some notes of Schæfer and Erfurdt being incorporated with the rest.

1822. Herman, in his own edition of the *Trachiniæ*; mentions



an edition of Sophocles which was published about this time, by Martin, at Hall. We have not seen the work.

In the same year, Whittaker published the plays, in a single volume, in London. The text and notes were taken from a comparison of both of Brunck's editions.

1824. Paris. Boissonade. 2 vols. 12mo. This is a pretty little edition, and forms the ninth volume of a series of Greek poets. A very few notes are added at the end.

1825. Lipsic. Dindorf. 12mo. This edition was printed at Lipsic, though some of the title-pages profess that it was published in London. The editor consulted three MSS. in the Laurentian library at Florence; but Elmsley had already extracted every thing that was valuable in that collection.

1826. We have mentioned above that Herman published an abridgment of Erfurdt's edition, in seven volumes duodecimo; the contents of these seven volumes have now been published in two volumes octavo in London; and like every thing else that comes from Herman, the notes are well worth the attention of scholars.

We have thus finished our review of the editions of Sophocles; and if we complained of the little which had been done for this author in the seventeenth century, and in the eighteenth till the time of Brunck, it appears that the critics and publishers of the nineteenth century are determined not to be remiss. There are probably many more editions, which we have omitted; and we have been obliged to take no notice of the publications of single plays; but the reader, who is interested in the works of Sophocles, will perhaps not be sorry to have this somewhat tedious summary of editorial labours. Elmsley, in his preface to the *Œdipus*, speaks of the six following editions as *nobilissimæ*; the Aldine, the second Junta, those of Turnebus, H. Stephens, Brunck's third edition, and that of Erfurdt. The great name of H. Stephens has perhaps alone caused him to be placed in this list; and if we were to make any addition to it, we should put in a word in favour of Johnson, who reigned almost alone in this country and on the continent for the former half of the last century, and of whom Elmsley scarcely makes any mention in his numerous publications.

We feel that little room remains for us to speak of the Oxford Variorum edition, which is now before us. We have said above, that it comprises more in two volumes than any other edition which has preceded it. If this remark were limited to the quantity of annotation, it would not be strictly true; for Erfurdt's notes are much more voluminous, as might be expected, when he made each play occupy a separate volume. Erfurdt also added the

Scholia : and this is not done in the Oxford edition, because the volume, which we have already noticed at the beginning of this article, forms the most accurate edition of the Roman Scholia, and may be considered as a companion to the other two. The fragments of the lost plays, the lexicon Sophocleum and the verbal index, which appeared for the first time in Brunck's edition, are added at the end of the second volume ; but it would have been better if the index had been copied from Musgrave's edition, which, as we stated above, is more copious than that of Brunck.

Having said so much in the preceding pages of Dr. Elmsley's criticisms, we shall devote the remainder of this article to mentioning those passages of Sophocles which he proposed to correct. We have taken the observations from the notes to his different plays : some of them, we perceive, have been noticed in the edition before us ; but many others have been omitted : we do not wish to defend them all, or to propose their being admitted into the text ; but having been in the habit of transcribing them in the margin of our own copy, those of our readers, who are equal admirers of Dr. Elmsley, may perhaps be pleased to do the same. We refer to the verses of the Oxford edition, and in most cases shall quote Elmsley's own words.

#### ŒDIPUS TYRANNUS.

18. οἷδε τ' ἡθέων. 1. οἱ δ' ἔτ' ἡθέων. ad Bacch. 693. Elmsley took no notice of this correction in his own edition of the Œ. T.

#### ŒDIPUS COLONEUS.

79. οἷδε γὰρ κρινούσι γε. Suspectas habeo particulas γὰρ et γε hoc modo positas. Malim, οἷδε γὰρ κρινούσιν εἶ. Si sana est vulgata, ordo est, οἷδε γε γὰρ κρινούσι. ad Med. 480.  
 408. οὐκ ἄρ' ἐμοῦ. legendum arbitror οὐ τᾶρα. ad Heracl. 269.  
 421. ἀλλ' οἱ θεοὶ σφί μῆτε τὴν πεπρωμένην. Mibi præstare videtur σφιν. ad Med. 393.  
 641. τῇδε γὰρ ξυνοίσομαι. 1. ξυνοίσομεν.  
 1266. τὰμῶ μὴ ἕ ἄλλων πύθη. Brunckius ex ingenio dedit τοῦτο pro τᾶλλα, rectius facturus si ταῦτα dedisset. ad Heracl. 669.  
 1506. τύχη<sup>ν</sup> τις ἐσθλὴν τῇσδ' ἔθηκε τῆς ὁδοῦ. legendum fortasse τύχη<sup>ν</sup> τις ἐσθλὴ ἔθηκε τήνδε τὴν ὁδόν. ad Heracl. 934.  
 1632. ὅς μοι (vel μου) χερὸς σῆς πίστιν ἀρχαίαν τέκνοις. ad Med. 21.

#### ANTIGONE.

76. σοὶ δ' εἰ δοκεῖ, Τὰ τῶν θεῶν ἔντιμ' ἀτιμάσας ἔχε. Hic non male legeretur σὺ δ', εἰ δοκεῖ, ad Med. 436.  
 96. πείσομαι γὰρ οὐ Τοσοῦτον οὐδέν. Malim πείσομαι γὰρ οὖν. ad Med. 804.  
 484. ἦ νῦν ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ ἀνὴρ. scribendum videtur ἦ τᾶρ'. ad Heracl. 651.  
 670. τοῦδε χρὴ κλύειν. Malim χρῆν. ad Heracl. 959.  
 1158. κατατρέπει. Ad lemma in Schol. adscripsit Elmsl. κατατρέπει. v. Brunck ad l.

## TRACHINIÆ.

237. Εὐβοίης. 1. Εὐβοίης. ad Heracl. 84.  
 307. ὦ δυστάλαινα, τίς ποτ' εἶ, νεανίδων; ita interpungendum videtur. ad Heracl. 567.  
 401. Εὐβοίης ut supra.  
 643. ἰάχων καταχάν ἐπάνεισιν. nemo non videt metro convenientius esse ἀχῶν. ad Heracl. 752.  
 677. ἀργῆτ' οἶδς εὐείρου πόκω. lego, ἀργῆτ' οἶδς ἐνέρου πόκον. ad Heracl. 693. Addend.  
 1228. λάβοι. malim λάβη. ad CEd. T. 903.

## AJAX.

98. ὥς (vulgo ὥσθ') οὐ ποτ' Αἴανθ' οἶδ' ἀτιμάσουσ' ἔτι. ad Med. 596.  
 108. πρὶν ἂν δεθείς πρὸς κίον' ἐρκείον στέγης. κίον' accusativus est. ad Heracl. 693, Addend.  
 1006. ποῖ γὰρ μολεῖν μοι δυνατόν, εἰς ποίους βρότους, τοῖς σοῖς ἀρήξαντ' ἐν πόνοισι μηδαμοῦ; sive μοι, quod malim, σίγῃ με legas, ἀρήξαντ' accusativus est. ad Heracl. 693, Addend.  
 1404. legendum τὸν θ' ὑψίβατον. ad CEd. T. 220.

## PHILOCTETES.

106. οὐκ ἄρ' ἐκείνῳ. legendum arbitror οὐ τᾶρ'. ad Heracl. 269.  
 114. οὐκ ἄρ' ὁ πέρσων. idem.  
 593. ἦ μὴν ἦ λόγῳ Πείσαντες ἄξειν. longe numerosius esset ἦ μὴν νιν λόγῳ. ad Med. 1271.  
 933. τὸν βίον μὴ μου 'φέλῃς. scribendum μ' ἀφέλῃς, vel plene μου ἀφέλῃς. ad Med. 56.  
 1172. τί μ' ὤλεσας; τί μ' εἵργασαι; malim εἵργάσω propter ὤλεσας. ad Med. 1319.  
 1381. ἂ σοί τε κάμοι κάλ' ὁρῶ τελούμενα. Rectius alii κάλ' ἂν ὁρῶ τελούμενα, id est, κάλα ἂν γενόμενα ὁρῶ, εἰ τελοῖτο. ad Med. 1067.  
 1440. τοῦτο δ' ἐννοεῖσθ'. rectius fortasse legeretur ἐννοεῖθ'. ad Med. 852.  
 1448. καὶ γὰρ γνώμη ταύτῃ τίθεμαι. legendum γνώμην ταύτην. ad Heracl. 1053.

## ELECTRA.

409. τῷ τοῦτ' ἤρεσεν; non dubito Sophoclem τὸδ' scripsisse.  
 960. ἦ πάρεστι μὲν στένειν Πλούτου πατρῷον κτῆσιν ἐστερημένη, Πάρεστι δ' ἀλγεῖν, ἐς τοσόνδε τοῦ χρόνου Ἀλεκτρα γηράσκουσιν ἀνυμέναιά τε. Quis vulgatæ scripturæ ita addictus est, ut non fateatur, poetam ante accusativum γηράσκουσιν potius ἐστερημένην quam ἐστερημένην fuisse scripturum? ad Med. 1207.  
 1006. λῆει γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὐδέν. Scribendum suspicor ἡμῖν. ad Med. 553.  
 1208. μὴ, πρὸς γενεῖον, μ' ἐξέλη (vulgo μὴ 'ξέλη) τὰ φίλτατα. ad Heracl. 977.  
 1312. οὐ ποτ' ἐκλήξω χαρᾶς Δακρυβροῦσα. Schæferi emendationem χαρᾶ pro χαρᾶς damnat. ad Med. 445.  
 1405. ἰὼ στέγαι Φίλων ἔρημοι, τῶν δ' ἀπολλύντων πλέα, ita scribo pro πλεία, quod analogiæ repugnat: a masculino πλέω derivatur femininum πλέα. ad Med. 259.

ART. II.—*The Life of John Sharpe, D. D. Lord Archbishop of York, to which are added, select Original, and Copies of Original Papers in Three Appendixes, collected from his Diary, Letters, and several other authentic Testimonies, by his Son, Thomas Sharpe, D.D. Archdeacon of Northumberland, Prebendary of York, Durham, and Southwell: Rector of Rethbury.* Edited by THOMAS NEWCOME, M.A. Rector of Shenly, Herts; and Vicar of Nottenham, Middlesex. London. Rivingtons. 1825. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

OF the character of the work before us we shall speak with as much brevity as the most laconic of our readers can desire. We shall merely assure them, that it is well put together, and replete with interest; and, further, we will venture to predict, that he who is induced, on our representation, to take it up, will not bring a railing accusation against us on the score of time lost or hours mis-spent in its perusal. But, on the subject of the volumes, the life and opinions of the great and good man, touching whom they bear record, we would willingly be more diffuse, convinced that his sentiments may be advantageously spread over a land, wherein there are many as anxious as he was to perform the arduous duties of their ministry, and well inclined, like him, to “live with God and nature, content with that communion,” heedless of the host of angry passions which flourish in a selfish and a wrangling world.

Born in 1644, and dying in 1713, Archbishop Sharpe, it will be allowed, lived in a period more chequered with events of high import than any similar space of time in the annals of British history. In an historical point of view, therefore, we strongly recommend the work, convinced that the sketch we are about to give, will, on that account, be received with additional interest. We are indebted to the Rev. T. Newcome, Rector of Shenly, for the arrangement of the valuable documents under consideration, documents on which we may implicitly rely, their authority being amply supported by proofs detailed in a preface extremely interesting, and creditable to its author.

Born at Bradford, February 16, 1644, the archbishop was there baptized according to the regular episcopal forms, a circumstance to which he always referred with pleasure, as the irregular administration of the rite, or its entire omission, was, at that time, frequent in all parts of the kingdom; and the fact is more re-



markable, because his father was not a little inclined to Puritanism, and a staunch supporter of the parliament party: so much so, that Lord Fairfax offered him a commission, which he would gladly have accepted, had not his wife, who was as staunch a royalist, put a decided and successful negative on the proceeding. She seems, indeed, to have been a woman of extraordinary parts and resolution, for, at the risk of incurring the displeasure (not to say worse) of the ruling powers and patrons of her husband's family, she not only persevered in a steady inflexible adherence to her own principles, but instilled into her son's mind that loyalty to the king, and respect for established usages, which formed a prominent feature in his character.

In justice to his father, it is but fair to add, that to him he was equally indebted, for an earnest and influential piety. If his mother taught him to love the liturgy in its spirit and truth, his father taught him how to practise it by his own example: there being something he noted

“in his father's manner of addressing himself to God, in secret,—something that smote his fancy so powerfully,—that he was wont to say himself, that the impressions he got whilst a child, from the visible earnestness and importunacy of his father in his private devotions, were so strong upon his mind as never to be worn out afterwards.”—p. 6.

But this good was not imbibed without a portion of alloy. Together with his father's devotional feelings he inherited his ultra-Calvinistic notions, and becoming a convert to the doctrines of absolute and irresistible decrees, he went up to the University of Cambridge in 1660, in the sixteenth year of his age, a rigid predestinarian, ready to enter the lists with any opponent who might venture to doubt how the utter rejection and reprobation of many millions of our fellow creatures could possibly add to the glory of God. Fortunately, he there fell into the hands of a sensible tutor, Mr. Brooksbank, who

“encouraged his young pupil to resort freely to him for a solution of whatever difficulties he met with in the course of his studies.”—p. 9.

Under the care of this worthy Mentor, he, by degrees, emancipated himself from the trammels of these dire dogmas, and, from that moment, we find his mind in a state of progressive and liberal expansion. He sought knowledge of every description, and amongst the students of his day, in the several branches of chemistry, botany, antiquarian research, and classical attainments, he stood unrivalled. We may collect from his lamentation, that the “study of mathematics was neglected while he was a youth,” that analytic philosophy formed a less prominent feature in the

academical education of that university than it does at present, but

“ he had naturally so clear a head, and so good a taste,” that we are not surprised at his cultivating and admiring the new philosophy of Newton, “ of which he used frequently to discourse,” and of which he always spoke with great delight, as “ setting forth the Creator in the most beautiful light that it was possible for us to conceive him in, with respect to external nature.”—p. 10.

To a mind like his, the lighter as well as graver attainments of science and literature were equally acceptable; and, therefore,

“ he took great delight not only in poetry as long as he lived, but, while he was a youth, in plays and romances too; and whatever was calculated to smite the fancy and move the passions. He had a happy talent of doing this himself, whenever he proposed to stir the affections, (which he thought of great use in preaching;) and it may be observed, in some of his sermons, how much, and how successfully, he hath, upon occasion, laboured this point.”—p. 14.

In the following note to Burnet's History, vol. iii. p. 100, we meet with a corroboration of this part of his character. “ He was a great reader of Shakspeare. Dr. Mangey, who had married his daughter, told me that he used to recommend to young divines the reading of the Scriptures and Shakspeare. And Dr. Lisle, bishop of Norwich, who had been chaplain at Lambeth to Archbishop Wake, told me, that it was often related there that Sharpe would say, that the Bible and Shakspeare made him Archbishop of York. His wonderful knowledge of human nature, the dignity and nobleness of his sentiments, and the amazing force and brightness of his expression, do indeed make Shakspeare to be a great pattern for the gravest and most solemn compositions.”

Having taken the degree of Master of Arts, in 1667, he was, by virtue of a faculty from the Archbishop of Canterbury, ordained deacon and priest on the same day, and, forthwith, became an inmate in the family of Sir Heneage Finch, then solicitor-general, as domestic chaplain and tutor to his sons, a situation highly respectable, and a period of life spent much to his satisfaction and improvement. His conduct, as might be expected, was such, as to insure the approbation of his patron, through whose application he was promoted to the Archdeaconry of Berks, a preferment followed up, in 1675, through the same interest, by his appointment to the rectory of St. Giles in the Fields; and, in the year following, he was married, by Dr. Tillotson, to a Mrs. Elizabeth Palmer; her mother being a puritan, and a particular friend and admirer of the famous Richard Baxter, “ would not consent to this treaty for her daughter till she

had consulted him." She did so accordingly, and Mr. Baxter, with the liberality so strongly depicted in his character, more particularly in the latter years of his life,

"not only consented and approved of the proposal, but such was the opinion he had of the Archdeacon, and such his esteem for him, that he told her, had he a daughter of his own to dispose of, he would not refuse her to Mr. Sharpe."—p. 28.

For the sixteen years during which he held the preferment of St. Giles's, it may be truly said, that he devoted his physical and mental energies to the service of his parishioners, frequently passing the greatest part of the night in his study.

"And now it was, and chiefly in those midnight hours which he borrowed from his rest, that he composed most of those discourses, which, afterwards, with a little revival and finishing, he made use of to his dying day."—p. 33.

Burnet, who was never thought partial to him, states, in the History of his own Times,

"He was both a very pious man, and one of the most popular preachers of the age, who had a peculiar talent of reading his sermons with much life and zeal."—vol. i. p. 674.

The following observations respecting his sermons are so admirable, that no apology is requisite for inserting them.

"He was careful and exact in the choice of his words, and used to say, that the point which put him most upon consideration in the making his sermons, was oftentimes how to make things plain enough, that is, to find out phrases suited and levelled to the capacities of the vulgar, and yet not vulgar enough themselves to offend the politest taste. He was not at a loss for words, significant and proper enough to express his sentiments, (and which came from him, with as much ease and readiness, as from any man living,) but he wanted to be understood by everybody, even his meanest auditors, at the first hearing, and to effect this, too, without using low and creeping similes, rustic phrases, or tedious repetitions, or, if possible, without impairing either the force of his argument or the beauty of his style. And whosoever can compass thus much, without weighing and adjusting his expressions before hand as well as his sentiments, has indeed a peculiar talent, and such as Dr. Sharpe never pretended to."—p. 39.

In the performance of the important duty of visiting the sick, we find him at all times actively employed; "though his compliance herein put him sometimes in hazard of his life," (p. 46,) occasionally exposing himself thereby to treacherous designs upon his person, "for it was at a particular time in King James's reign, when he had grounds for distrust," (p. 46,) and to the still greater

danger of contagion, for he never had the small pox. Amidst the variety of business which occupied his attention, he found but little time for his lighter pursuits; he contrived, however, to pay considerable attention to the study of coins and medals, so much so, that, in the latter part of his life, his collection, especially of the Saxon English coins, was inferior to few in England.

In 1681, he was appointed to the deanery of Norwich, at the joint intercession of the Duke of York, Lord Arlington, and his old and constant patron, the Lord Chancellor Finch. A preferment particularly acceptable, as affording opportunities of studying more at leisure than he could in town, at the same time recruiting his health, and relieving him from the fatigues of his parochial cure; and, what was still of more consequence to him, "of improving in his spiritual life, through the advantages of retirement, and disengagement from company and business."—p. 51.

About this period, he published some works of a controversial nature upon the subject of schisin; but, however objectionable such publications must have been to the dissenters, some of whom immediately replied to his arguments, yet

"Mr. Sharpe had this benefit from his mild and inoffensive way of managing the subject, that his adversary treated him with a better temper, and in a gentler strain, than is usual with men of that persuasion."—p. 60.

On the death of King Charles II., in 1685, he drew up an address for the grand jury of the city of London upon his brother's happy accession, some passages of which admit the doctrine of passive obedience in its utmost extent, for which his biographer, however, makes the following defence.

"It has been remarked, that most of the addresses upon this occasion ran in a warm, some think too warm, a strain of loyalty. And possibly, some objections may be made to certain expressions of this address, of serving the king (as upon a foot of duty) to the utmost extremity. But it is to be remembered, that although no man had a more unshaken loyalty than Dr. Sharpe, or could be more firmly attached to the service and interests of his prince than he was; yet he never taught or held any principles of submission, but what were agreeable to the constitution. For he always laid down the laws of the land as the rule and measure of obedience. And, therefore, his general expressions should be understood with such limitation as the principles he professed, and to which he ever inviolably adhered, will admit of, or rather will confine them to."—p. 65.

The very year after this address was presented, Dr. Sharpe, happening to treat upon some points in the Romish controversy



in the pulpit, he fell under the displeasure of the king ; and, together with his diocesan, was the first over whom the unprecedented authority and illegal power of the celebrated ecclesiastical commission was exercised. To add to the bitterness, as well as illegality of the proceedings, the Bishop of London, on the very day following the loss of two of Dr. Sharpe's sons in two successive days, received a royal command to suspend him forthwith " from further preaching in any parish church or chapel of his diocese " until he had given satisfaction to the king, whose further pleasure should be then known. The spirited reply of the Bishop of London ought not pass unnoticed ; it was written to Lord Sunderland, president of the council, and forwarded by the hands of Dr. Sharpe.

" My Lord.—I always have and shall count it my duty to obey the king in whatever commands he lays upon me, that I can perform with a safe conscience. But in this I humbly conceive I am obliged to proceed according to LAW, and, therefore, it is impossible for me to comply, because, though his majesty commands me only to execute his pleasure, yet, in the capacity I am to do it, I must act as JUDGE. And your Lordship knows no judge condemns any man before he hath knowledge of the cause, and hath cited the party. However, I sent to Mr. Dean and acquainted him with his majesty's displeasure, whom I find so ready to give all reasonable satisfaction, that I have thought fit to make him the bearer of this answer, from him that will never be unfaithful to the king, or otherwise than—My Lord, Your Lordship's most humble servant, H. London."—p. 82.

On the same day the doctor drew up his own petition to the king, which, we are sorry to say, was couched in very different terms, and proves that there are times and seasons when the purest principles may lack the support of resolution. It was a doleful specimen of passive obedience.

" If, in any sermon," (to use his own words) " any words or expressions have unwarily slipt from him, liable to such construction as to give your majesty cause of offence, he earnestly prayeth, that your majesty, of your royal grace and clemency, would be pleased to lay aside the displeasure you have conceived against your humble petitioner, and restore him, &c. &c."—83.

His advocates may palliate the weakness into which he was thus betrayed, but the Christian world should be aware that there is a tribunal above all earthly thrones, before which the consciences of men are alone amenable.

It is with real pleasure we have to add, that on subsequent occasions Dr. Sharpe showed a firmness sufficient to efface the stigma which this event might have left on his character. This he had soon an opportunity of evincing, by refusing to appear

before the ecclesiastical commission, to show cause why he had not obeyed a royal order respecting that celebrated declaration, which led to the committal of the seven bishops in the year 1688. His reasons for refusing to appear are contained in a paper drawn up by him, either for his own defence or for the satisfaction of such as applied to him for advice on this occasion; but it is too long for insertion. This manly avowal of opinions was the more creditable, since we are told, "he never in his life meddled or interposed in affairs of state, further than was incumbent upon him by virtue of his station and office," (p. 96.) The great changes which soon afterwards ensued, rendered further resistance, on the part of the church, unnecessary. In a short space of time, those who had heretofore aided and abetted encroachments on the liberty of the subject, were called to an account for their conduct. Amongst others, the notorious Jefferies had been committed to the tower, where Dr. Sharpe, from a feeling of gratitude for private personal obligations, and remembering that this judge, though unjust to many, had been a friend to him in his own troubles, thought proper to evince his sense of past kindness by visiting him.

"My Lord was not a little surprised at his constancy, as appears by his salutation of him at his first entrance into the room, in these words, '*What! dare you own me now?*' The Doctor, seeing his condition, judged he should not lose the opportunity of being serviceable to his lordship as a divine, if it was in his power to be so; and freely expostulated with him upon his public actions, and '*particularly the affair in the west.*' To which last charge his lordship returned this answer: '*That he had done nothing in that affair without the advice and concurrence of . . . . . who now,*' said he, '*is the darling of the people.*' His lordship further complained much of the reports that went about concerning him, particularly that of his giving himself up to hard drinking in his confinement, which he declared was grounded upon nothing more than his present seasonable use of punch, to alleviate the pressures of stone or gravel under which he then laboured."—97.

These were times when the consciences of the most upright must have been severely tried, and there probably never was a season in which a "*ductor dubitanti*" would have been more frequently referred to. The throne became vacant according to the vote of the House of Commons on Jan. 27th, and on the 30th, it so happened, that Dr. Sharpe, having on the preceding Sunday preached before the Prince of Orange, was appointed to preach before the House of Commons on Wednesday the 30th, during which interval, it should be observed, the service of the church had not been altered by authority, neither as yet had the Lords sanctioned the decisions of the lower House respecting the ques-

tion of abdication. Here then was a dilemma. Dr. Sharpe, however, without hesitation, both in presence of the prince and before the House of Commons, "did, as usual, pray for King James." The following memorandum, in Dr. Sharpe's own hand, is annexed to a copy of the vote of thanks which was passed on the occasion.

"This sermon here desired to be printed, was that which I preached on Jan. 30, after the House had made a vote, that King James had abdicated. Nevertheless, in my prayer before sermon, I prayed for King James as I used to do. At which, and, I believe, at some passages in the sermon, great offence was taken by several of the warm men in the House of Commons; and complaint was made by the speaker, Mr. Powel, to the House, that very afternoon. Upon which a great debate arose, which took up all their time that night, but nothing was concluded. The next day, being the 31st of January, was the day of thanksgiving for the arrival of the Prince of Orange. And then Dr. Burnet preached before the House. The day after, when the House was set, the first motion that was made was for thanks, &c., for my sermon, which produced this vote. Sir John Knight made the motion. *But for all this order I did not print my sermon.*"—p. 99.

In the following year he was appointed to the deanery of Canterbury, on the removal of Dr. Tillotson to that of St. Paul's, and soon after he was selected by the king to supply one of the sees vacated by the "deprivations of the bishops." Whatever blame we might have for a moment attached to him in a case already mentioned, his conduct on this occasion was beyond all praise, for although two or three were offered,

"he waved all these offers on account of the dispossessed bishops being yet alive, with whom he was acquainted, and for whom he bore respect: and as to Norwich, in particular, he declared, that having lived hitherto in great friendship with its bishop, he could not think of taking his place, but rather chose to continue in his present situation, than remove to more honourable posts under such circumstances as made them no ways tempting to him, or agreeable to his inclination."—p. 108.

It is to be regretted, that the cold apathetic mind of the new monarch was proof against such a display of amiable and praiseworthy feelings. On the contrary, they excited his displeasure; for we are told, the king was "not a little disgusted at his peremptory refusal of those preferments," (p. 109,) and but for the active interference of Dr. Tillotson, here, in all probability, Dr. Sharpe had forfeited all further favours from court; but by the judicious management of this his never failing friend, his steady refusal of preferment under existing circumstances became the means of a still greater, and a still more unexpected advancement, for on the death of Archbishop Lampleugh, he was, in May, 1691, in the



47th year of his age, appointed to the see of York, which high station he held for twenty-two years.

The Second Part of the work commences at this period, and contains his character as bishop, and his proceedings in his diocese. At his entrance upon this great charge, he laid down to himself certain rules. One was for the encouragement of the clergy, viz. to "bestow the prebends in his gift upon such only as were either beneficed in his diocese or retained in his family." The other, more properly, respected the laity, viz. "never to meddle or anywise concern himself in the election of members of parliament." To the former determination, with the exception of an appointment of two of his former pupils, the Hon. Mr. H. and the Hon. Mr. E. Finch, connexions, it will be remembered, of that family to which he owed all he had, he adhered so strictly, that of forty-six stalls which he filled, in less than half that number of years, all were filled agreeably to the foregoing resolution, and the candidates for them were invariably selected from such as lived in his diocese, and had recommended themselves to him by doing their duties in their respective parochial cures.

The promotion of his clergy was also marked by respect for their freedom of opinion, as he ever "guided himself in dispensing his favours to them, not by their political principles, but by their moral characters and parochial labours."—(p. 140.) He was wont to address them in a frank, ingenuous, kind and affectionate manner; hoping they

"would take in good part his freedom, and plainness wherewith he delivered himself; declaring it was not a humour of talking magisterially that put him upon it, but a sense of his own duty, and a hearty good will to them; that he had no design upon earth but that both they and himself might be good, and adorn the profession to which they were called."—p. 154.

His knowledge of human nature and the world led him to dislike and discourage societies for the reformation of manners.

"He was unwilling to check well-meaning people in any design that seemed to tend to God's honour and the good of mankind, and yet he feared whereunto the liberty that those societies begun to take *would grow*."—p. 170.

We wish our limits would allow us to insert the whole of an interesting correspondence between himself and certain clergymen, who, with more zeal than judgment, had established a society of this description; but we must satisfy ourselves with a few extracts illustrative of his meaning.

"I must confess, (says he,) I think it is of a great deal more consequence."  
NO. I.—JAN. 1827.



quence, both to a man's self and to the public, that he use all means possible to be devout, humble, charitable, and (in a word) in all things to live like a Christian himself, than to be zealous in *informing against others* who do not live like Christians. The first is of certain benefit, both to a man's self and others; but the other may be often indiscreet and vexatious."—p. 175.

Again—

"I myself have always been averse to such sort of confederacies or combinations, whether of clergy or others, as are now *on foot every where*, whether they be those they call Religious Societies or those of a later standing, which go under the name of Societies for Reformation; as doubting whether they be legal in themselves, and apprehending, likewise, that some time or other we may feel ill consequences from them,"—p. 182.

Here again we cannot but notice his respect for the opinions of others; for, notwithstanding his own views, he adds—

"Nevertheless, being sensible that a great *many wise and good men do approve of these societies*, I will not think the worse of any man for engaging in them. Nor shall these societies meet with any discouragement from me, so long as they keep within the bounds which the laws of the land and of the Church have prescribed."—p. 185.

We come now to Part III., containing his more public transactions in Church and State.

Having borne testimony to the simplicity of his character in his more private capacity, we are now to follow him into the wider ocean of public life; and there we are gratified with a similar display of purity and disinterestedness, only to be fully appreciated by those who are aware of the temptations to which men in high office are exposed, and the frailty of human nature when it meets them in its pathway. We have seen him, in a former period of his life, extending his views of allegiance to its utmost verge; but this he did, most unquestionably, from a deep and overpowering sense of duty. But although no one could be more averse than he was to party spirit, he was generally considered a party man. "Those who were called the Tories, or the High Church party, claimed him as theirs;" for he was observed more generally to approve and favour their principles, and to go more along with them, than those of the other side: but he was never known to oppose any man of real worth upon account of party distinctions; nor would he consent even to the recommendation of royalty itself, when candidates were named for offices whose religious principles or morals were ill spoken of or suspected, though they were otherwise of great abilities,—“useful to the ministry or favoured at court.”—(p. 335.) Few, we fear,

would have taken upon themselves to be so explicit as he was in remonstrating with the very highest person in the kingdom. In the case of Sir John Fenwick, the King spoke to him and the Bishop of Norwich, and

“did with a great deal of earnestness (as he expresses it,) recommend the passing the bill of attainder (against him); telling them how much his government was concerned in it. I then told him, (he adds,) that I had always, in my own mind, been against bills of attainder. He bid us consider well of the thing, and he hoped we would.”—p. 295.

But notwithstanding this strong hint, Dr. Sharpe without hesitation voted against it; eight more of the bishops acted with equal spirit, in opposition to the rest of the bench, one of whom, the Bishop of Sarum, so “grievously resented” Dr. Sharpe’s vote, “that it occasioned some little ruffle between them, either in the House or in the lobby.” Again, in his diary, Feb. 2, 1707-8, we find the following:—

“At Kensington the queen pressed me to serve her in voting against the bill to dissolve the Scotch council. I begged of her majesty not to lay her commands upon me, for I must vote according to my judgment, and according as I am satisfied what is for the interest of her majesty and of the kingdom, for I would make no distinction between them.”—p. 303.

And a few pages after, we read—

“I had a great deal of talk (with the queen); I assured her that I loved her, and would do her all the service that I could. Nay, and if she should use me ill, I should always behave myself like a dutiful subject. She told me she hoped I would always do what she desired: I told her, if she desired reasonable things, I would. . . . and that I must be satisfied in my own judgment that they were reasonable, for I acted upon principles, and must satisfy my own conscience.”—p. 322.

The editor observes, on some of these cases, that it will be very natural for those who consider him as attached to a party, to interpret all these reserves to his own judgment as the “effect of a resolution” not to drop the Tories; but this was not the case, for he not only frequently voted against them, “but would exert his interest too in opposition to them, as often as he judged they were taking wrong steps.”—p. 304.

Much against his inclination, he accepted in 1702, at the queen’s earnest request, the situation of almoner to her majesty; and in a few days subsequent, was sworn at the chancery bar for the office of commissioner for the Scotch Union; and soon afterwards he was again sworn a privy counsellor.

For that “glorious and ever memorable” act, as it is styled, of

the queen's reign, commonly called her "Bounty," the Church is very considerably indebted to the share he had in procuring and arranging the act for that purpose. The idea was, indeed, originally from Dr. Burnet, in the late reign, as the reader will find on referring to his work;\* but to Dr. Sharpe we are perhaps equally indebted for its completion, as he most sedulously watched over the progress of the bill, "continuing very active in whatever related to the completing the design."

About this period a convocation was much talked of, for settling various points connected with the interests of the Church in the way of amendment, alterations, &c.; but after much discussion, it fell through. The archbishop, indeed, did not manifest any extraordinary zeal in bringing it about, being probably apprehensive that the times in which he lived were not quite "seasonable for such proposals." His opinion of the Established Church will best appear from his own words, delivered upon a very solemn occasion and in a very solemn manner.

"If we take our measures, (says he,) concerning the truths of religion, from the rules of the Holy Scriptures and the platform of the primitive Churches, the Church of England is undoubtedly, both as to its doctrine and worship, the purest Church that is at this day in the world; the most orthodox in faith, and the freest, on the one hand, from idolatry and superstition, and on the other hand, from freakishness and enthusiasm, of any now extant. Nay, I do further say, with great seriousness, and as one that expects to be called to account at the dreadful tribunal of God for what I now say if I do not speak in sincerity, that I do in my conscience believe, that if the religion of Jesus Christ, as it is delivered in the New Testament, be the true religion, (as I am certain it is,) then the Communion of the Church of England is a safe way to salvation, and the safest of any I know in the world."—p. 354.

We have before noticed his disapprobation of those injudicious ministers who sought to attract his notice and secure his favour by railing against dissenters, to which they were possibly urged by a prevailing opinion that he "was a warm man against sectarists;" but this opinion of him seems rather to be grounded upon another equally mistaken one, viz. his supposed inviolable attachment to a party, than upon any just reasons. It is true, he pressed his arguments against separation and schism with warmth and earnestness in his sermons and writings; but it will be seen in them, also, with how mild a temper and with how Christian a spirit he treats the dissenters themselves. He compassionates their weakness, but never exclaims at their obstinacy, or attempts to raise resentment or indignation against them. He never

\* Burnet's *Own Times*, 8vo. edit. vol. 5. p. 119.

treated them, or spoke of them, but with that calm spirit which visibly runs through his writings; and as he hated every thing

“that bordered upon bitterness or violence, so he was even shocked to hear them vilified and maltreated in the pulpit, which he abhorred should be prostituted to such purposes.”—p. 357.

Upon the much-contested subject of Lay Baptism, we find his own opinion, similar to that of the Archbishop of Canterbury and other heads of the Church, thus expressed in his diary, dated April 22, 1712:—

“At eleven o’clock I went to Lambeth. We were in all thirteen bishops. We had a long discourse about lay baptism, which of late hath made such a noise about the town. We all agreed that baptism by any other person except lawful ministers ought, as much as may be, to be discouraged; nevertheless, whoever was baptized by any other person, and in that baptism the essentials of baptism were preserved, that is, being dipped or sprinkled in the name of the Father, &c., such baptism was valid, and ought not to be repeated. This, indeed, is the sense of the Church of England, as will appear to any person who considers the rubrics in the office for private baptism, and compares them with one another and with the previous questions in the office itself. From all which laid together it may be plainly collected, that where the essentials, matter and form, have been preserved, though administered by another hand than that of a lawful minister, the baptism shall not be so much as hypothetically repeated; yet, nevertheless, it is so far condemned and disapproved, as irregular and uncanonical, that the child or person so baptized shall not be received into the congregation: but the officiating minister shall have recourse to the directions of his ordinary, as in other irregular, and uncommon, and difficult cases. But as our Church hath no where openly and expressly declared for the validity of lay baptism, or allowed it to be administered by laymen in any case, how extraordinary soever, some handle is left for disputing or speaking doubtfully about her sense of the matter.”—p. 371.

The result of this conversation was, that the Archbishop of Canterbury and a few other bishops drew up a declaration, expressing an opinion

“That such persons as have already been baptized in or with water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, ought not to be baptized again,” &c.

On receiving a copy of this declaration, Dr. Sharpe wrote to the archbishop, stating—

“That to leave the question as much undecided as it is left in the public offices and canons of the Church, was a good security to discipline; and that an open declaration in favour of the dissenters’ baptism might prove inconvenient, from the bad use that might be made of it.”—p. 374.



The next business in which we find him taking a prominent part, was in favour of the Episcopal Clergy of Scotland, who, by his active interference, were relieved from those severities with which they had been before treated. In testimony of which, a letter is annexed, from the clergy of the diocese of Aberdeen, acknowledging that "to the happy effect of his grace's friendly endeavours" they were indebted for an extension of the queen's private bounty towards them, especially to the bishops of Edinburgh and Aberdeen, and to the only surviving archbishop of Scotland, Dr. John Paterson, Archbishop of Glasgow, burthened with age and infirmities, eleven children and great poverty, for whom was procured a grant of £300 per annum, out of the rents of his archbishopric, during his life, and £200 per annum, for fifteen years more, towards the support and maintenance of his children. It will be gratifying to those who have been and still are interested in the cause of those suffering and patient Christians, the Vaudois, to learn that from Dr. Sharpe they experienced the most marked attention and most lively sympathy. King William and Queen Mary had granted all their reign, or at least for many years of it, a pension of £425 to these people. But this pension having been struck off, when he came to be made almoner to the queen, he put into her hand a memorial of the pensions that had been paid in the late reign, among which he set down this to the Vaudois: but this taking no effect, he not only wrote to the lord treasurer, but subsequently pressed the queen so closely upon the subject, that she consented to continue the payment.

In 1706 we find him busily employed in aiding the dissolved Greek Churches in Armenia and Egypt, and in an attempt, which unfortunately failed, of introducing the Liturgy of the Church of England into Prussia;—it is given in detail, together with the correspondence of the several parties concerned in the transaction, and with this ends the first volume.

We have, hitherto, considered Dr. Sharpe in his public, rather than his private character, as he was before men. The second volume (and we think it the most interesting) exhibits him in the more retired walks of life, not only in his intercourse with those friends who shared his affections and confidence, but in communion also with himself in the inner man of the heart. It consists, as the Editor informs us, of some few memorials of his private friendship, correspondence, benefactions, and such personal qualities as recommended him to the world as a private man; to which is added, a short account of his spiritual or religious life.

In entering upon this department of our duty, we must confess that we feel at a loss where to draw the limit, and where to check our pen in its gratifying task of inditing the praises of one to

whom so much praise is justly due. We will commence with his simplicity, a prominent virtue in his character. Thus it stands recorded.

“He had nothing of intrigue in his temper; nothing covert or suspicious, either in his discourse or in his outward demeanour; had no notion of perplexing or amusing those he conversed with by any kind of disguise, but was, in every instance, and throughout his whole conduct, a man without guile. It has already been observed, that such an open and artless conduct might prove a disadvantage to him in his conferences and correspondences with the courtiers; and his utter want of some degree of polite subtlety might be interpreted as a diminution of his abilities for public service. However that was, they who valued themselves most on their dexterity of address, could not have a meaner opinion of his simplicity, than he had of every species of dissimulation, not excepting the most refined. Double meanings and evasions could never be so elegantly and speciously dressed up as to hide their ill shapes and deformity from his eyes. The finest parts and rarest endowments lost most of their merit with him, if they did not appear accompanied with sincerity, singleness and uprightness of design; which are the chief beauty and only real worth both of words and actions.”—p. 2.

His conversational talents may be estimated by their effect upon those who were fortunate enough to share his society. For he

“never refused to converse with any who were admitted to him with great cheerfulness and condescension; and he had this peculiar happiness, that though he talked so much, and in so free and open, and, in appearance, careless a manner, yet he did it with so great a guard upon himself, that he hardly ever gave offence to any that sat with him, and very rarely occasion to reproach himself for his inadvertency. His conversation, too, was contrived and adapted for the entertainment of all that heard him;” and, in his introduction of serious subjects, he was so prudent, “both as to measure and manner, that it was disagreeable to none, but welcome to most.” Yet, though such were his “darling subjects,” there was no topic so “trifling, and so much out of his own way, but he would pleasantly enter into it, for the sake of making himself agreeable to such as were addicted to this sort of conversation and pleased with it. A noted fox hunter, in Yorkshire, that dined with him, was surprised at his entertaining him so suitably with a discourse about horses, and said, after he came away, that surely the Archbishop had been reading the *Gentleman’s Jockey*.”—p. 51.

To his clergy, too, he was invariably affable and hospitable.

“The meanest man in his diocese who wore a gown” being welcome “at his table as often as he pleased;” and was received with as much kindness and civility as if “providence had set them both upon a level.”  
p. 52.

It is almost unnecessary to add, that in such a character charity, in the widest sense of the word, shone pre-eminent; it was not merely the charity of imparting aid to those who were in want, it was charity in the gospel sense of the word, it was good will to man founded on love to God. The Editor classes it under three heads:—1. Resolving doubts and removing unnecessary scruples of conscience. 2. Making peace in divided families, by accommodating their differences. 3. Acts of liberality and charity to persons in want. Proofs of these are annexed, with some interesting letters in the Appendix, exemplifying his mode of proceeding under the second head of the above division. His actual disbursements under the third head were astonishing; he decimated, in the first place, the whole profits of his preferments and estates, the distribution of which fund was exclusive of most liberal donations in numberless other cases, particularly to his poorer clergy.

Such are a few of the traits which marked the character of this excellent man. We would willingly, as we have before hinted, be more diffuse; but our pages admonish us that we are drawing near to the prescribed limits of our praise. We shall, therefore, conclude this part of our subject in the words of his biographer:

‘By these acts of piety and charity that were known, let those be measured, or guessed at, that were not known.’—p. 60.

From his deeds we would now follow him to his thoughts: and it is not often that a biographer is enabled to do this; but happily, in the present instance, we have it in our power to show, not only what he was before men, but before God. We allude to an invaluable portion of the work before us, consisting of copious extracts from a private journal, in which he was in the habit of recording his thoughts and observations upon almost every transaction public and private in which he was engaged. This diary, it is observed, will

“form a guide able to conduct us into his retirements, and to show him in some of his private communications with heaven, and of his most secret acts of religion.”—p. 62.

They, indeed, who make light of private devotions, and of all human endeavours to keep up a constant and daily intercourse with heaven, will, of course, pass over this part of the memoirs. This apprehension, it seems, pressed so strongly on the compiler, that he had serious thoughts of suppressing these extracts from the diary; his motive we respect and can fully enter into; but we rejoice that he was finally prevailed upon to dis-

regard it. It appears that in 1688, the 44th year of his age, Dr. Sharpe began to enter into a more extraordinary course of devotion and private exercise of piety than he had practised before that time. By a reflection upon his own past life, minuted 1682, we indeed learn that he had for several years lived "very carefully;" but well is it remarked, that the charge of a large parish, with all its routine of duties, together with repeated disappointments and interruptions, and the controversies of those times, were enough to disconcert and estrange his mind from that placid state of piety which a Christian should ever aim at and covet. The reader may be curious to learn the scenes and spots consecrated by his hallowed aspirations:—

"In the summer time, when he resided at Bishopsthorp, and when the weather was fair, he usually offered these thanksgivings *sub dio*, either in his garden or in the adjoining fields and meadows, whither he frequently walked to perform his devotions."—p. 78.

Again, when the plantations which he had made in his garden were grown up to some perfection, he changed the scene of his thanksgivings, and offered them up in a particular walk, which from thence he called his "temple of praise." It was a close grass-plot walk, lying north and south, and hedged on each side with yew, so thick and high as to be completely shaded at all times of the day except noon. On the east it had a little maze or wilderness that grew considerably. The entrance into it at each end was through arches made in a lime hedge, and the view through these arches immediately bounded by a hedge of horn-beam at one end, and a fruit wall on the other. So that from within the walk, scarce any thing was to be seen but verdure and the open sky above. In this close walk, and in the adjoining maze, we are assured he spent many a happy hour, especially in the last years of his life. Thus, for instance, he notes in 1712:—

"After evening prayers I walked in my garden, and there, in my temple of praise, poured out my soul to God in an unusual ardent manner, so that I think I was never so rapturously devout in my life."—p. 79.

And again, the parish church of Acaster, rurally situated in the fields, within a short mile of his palace, was another favourite spot. Thither he frequently retired alone, and made its little porch his oratory. We believe there are few amongst our readers who, knowing the charm of going forth to meditate at eventide, have not, like the Archbishop, selected their own secluded spots, in which they hear a voice we cannot hear, and see a hand we cannot see,—spots in which thoughts and deeds of times passed make their deep and lasting impressions; and amongst these



the retirement of a country church has attractions which few can resist.

We have hitherto, with one exception, been silent respecting his failings; but we rather gladly allude to another as evidence in favour of his superiority and strength of character, fully agreeing with the editor, that if

“any impartial person should know all his failures, with his conduct of or under them, he would rather admire and love him the more, than esteem him the less for them.”—p. 89.

It will scarcely be believed then that his prevailing infirmity was passion:—

“the most prevalent in his nature was choler; but he so managed and subdued it, that oftentimes when he was angry, it could hardly be perceived that his passion was stirred.”—p. 89.

He who can at all times thus subdue his angry feelings, and controul the overflowings of an irritable temper, has achieved a victory which renders the minor skirmishes with our failings comparatively insignificant.

We have now one other scene of his life to touch upon, but it is the most important, being that of his transition from his earthly to his heavenly state. At the close of 1713 his appetite failed him, and he grew very weak and exceedingly dispirited. On Sunday, Dec. 6, he attended service in his chapel for the last time; and on the Wednesday following, after making some alterations in his will, he concluded his diary (his hand being grown so unsteady that his characters are scarcely legible,) with these words:—

“All well, I thank God; but I am horribly dull and dispirited as ever a poor man was.”—p. 91.

The next day, by the advice of his physicians, he set out for Bath, but his strength decreased, his memory decayed—his hour was evidently nigh at hand, and human means of no avail. The approach of death was however gradual; he grew daily weaker and weaker: all that was particularly observed by those about him was, that he “prayed continually;” and the chief token by which they perceived how his strength declined was, “his shortening of his prayers.” A little before he expired, he told his lady that “he should be happy.” The last words he said were those of Mr. Herbert—“Ah, my dear God, though I am clean forgot,” &c. He had these words often in his mouth while he was in health; but would add, that Mr. Herbert was much dispi-

rited when he wrote them. He departed this life Feb. 2, 1713, aged 69.

We wish for a moment to turn the reader's attention to his dying words and feelings. It will be observed that so far from being in a strain of exultation and confidence, they are rather doubtful, not to say desponding in their style. What are we to infer from this? that such men as Dr. Sharpe and Mr. Herbert were unprepared for death, or in a state which justified such an absence of confidence and reasonable assurance? By no means: and we allude to it for the very purpose of contrasting these dying Christians' feelings with those which are daily forced upon our attention in the published narratives of criminals whose lives have been little else than a continued series of vice. Scarcely an assize elapses but the pages of the Newgate Calendar announce in rhapsodies the happy deaths of murderers, and the exulting assurance of the most abandoned criminals that all will be well with them. Far be it from us to limit the power, intentions, or mercy of the Almighty, but we would put it to the sound judgment and common sense of the more sober and rational of those at whose suggestion this confidence is imparted, whether they act wisely or discreetly in so doing? He who stands upon the very verge and threshold of eternity—who is upon the point of quitting his frail and sinful tenement of earth for the unspotted purity of the World of Spirits, ought to be, and must be, unless his mind is in a state of enthusiastic aberration, impressed with an awful sense of his situation, and a decent sobriety, utterly at variance with the wild exultation of absolute certainty. He will, with a humble and entire reliance on his Saviour, be preparing to meet his God: but while with the dying Christian before us, he trusts that "all is well," and expresses a hope of happiness, as a convicted criminal suffering for his misdeeds, he should also in a tenfold degree feel that he is in "a low state, a poor man dull and dispirited," and his soul ought not, when he dwells upon the past, to be without its peculiar disquietings. And surely such would be fitter and more appropriate sentiments and feelings to encourage and instil than those to which we have alluded; feelings which were never sanctioned by him who died upon the Cross, and which must in many cases operate as a fatal delusion to the living, and, for what we know, may lead the dying and the dead to fearful disappointment and endless remorse.

---

ART. III. — *Critical Essays on Genesis, Ch. xx., and on St. Matthew, Ch. ii. 17. 18., with Notes.* By the Rev. CHARLES FORSTER, B.D. Chancellor of Ardfert, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Limerick. Dublin, Milliken. London, T. Cadell. 8vo. pp. 80. 4s.

THE professed aim of Mr. Forster in the publication of these Essays, is to lower the estimation of the modern system of biblical criticism. With this view he endeavours to weaken our confidence in the judgment of its founder, by an examination of his hypothesis with respect to the twentieth chapter of Genesis: and to detract from the value of one of its favourite theories, by showing, that its assistance is not required in one of the instances in which the majority of modern commentators have most willingly resorted to its aid; namely, in the exposition, or rather, the explaining away of the declaration of St. Matthew, (ch. ii. 17, 18,) that in the murder of the Innocents at Bethlehem a remarkable prophecy of Jeremiah was “fulfilled.”

The hypothesis of Simon (the reputed father of the school to which Mr. Forster alludes) with respect to the twentieth chapter of Genesis, as stated in his “*Histoire Critique*,” is, that it has suffered transposition, and now occupies a different situation in the text, from that in which it was originally placed by its author. His idea of the origin of this supposed perturbation of the order of Scripture will be noticed hereafter; for the present it will be sufficient to observe, that as Simon produces the example of this chapter, as the “*foundational evidence*” of the existence of the evil, to account for which his general theory is proposed; it is clear, that if the example itself be found inefficient for its purpose, our confidence in the discretion of one, who thus brings forward a theory, however ingenious, to account for a fact, the very existence of which is problematical, will be very materially shaken.

Mr. Forster, therefore, in the former of the two Essays before us, undertakes to show, that the transposition in question is not only uncalled for by the necessity, but untenable upon a fair statement of the probabilities, of the case; and, in this view, first directs his attention to the subversion of the only argument alleged by Simon in its favour, and upon which that learned critic is content to rest his cause. This argument is, in fact, no other than an assumption of the impossibility of Sarah’s being, at the advanced age at which the transaction took place, the object of Abimelec’s love. “*Il est dit*,” says Simon, “*que le roi Abimelec*

*devint amoureux de Sara* : et cependant l'historien avoit déjà dit, un peu auparavant, que Sara et Abraham étoient fort avancés en âge." The age of Abraham himself, at this time, appears, from Gen. xvii. 1, to have been ninety-nine; and, from Gen. xvii. 17, we learn, that Sarah was ten years younger than her husband.

In reply to this incomparable argument for the transposition contended for, it might seem sufficient, with Mr. Forster, to observe, that, taking the other parts of the book in which it is recorded as they stand, the age of Sarah, compared with the then ordinary durations of life, did not exceed that, at which experience shows it not to be uncommon, even now, for women to become the objects of very passionate admiration: nay, that particular examples might be cited from more modern histories, of females who retained their charms to an age, *comparatively*, far exceeding that of Sarah. But in the case before us it should more especially be remembered, that, though both Abraham and Sarah had indeed, before the revelation of her approaching conception, given up the hope of children, their journey to Gerar took place, after so much at least of the vigour, if not the comeliness, of youth had been restored to the latter as is implied in her becoming a mother. The whole affair, which Simon seems most unaccountably to have forgotten, was miraculous; and, to quote the just observations of Mr. Forster upon it,

"it would be doing sad injustice to the present subject, to speak of Abraham and Sarah as of ordinary human beings. By the pre-ordination and solemn benediction of Jehovah, these favoured individuals had been set apart to become the ancestors of God's chosen people,—to become the parents of the promised seed. It seemed fitting to unerring Wisdom to prove the faith of the patriarch, by withholding from his earnest expectation the heir of the promise, until both father and mother 'were well stricken in years.' But Divine Providence generally employs natural and ordinary means, for the accomplishment even of its most extraordinary dispensations. Sarah, therefore, being constituted, from the beginning, the pre-appointed mother of the Child of Promise, we may well conceive the counsels of the Divine Disposer to have so ordered it, that her constitution should be originally endued with, and should retain, to the appointed period of the birth of Isaac, a buoyancy and freshness, which would discover themselves in the life and freshness of her countenance and port. It is remarkable, that Abimelec saw her in the very year which immediately preceded the birth of Isaac; between the periods of God's last renewal of the promise unto Abraham, and of its blessed consummation: an interval in which, if at any one moment in the life of Sarah, the agency of the heavenly blessing must be presumed to have been peculiarly operative in renovating her frame." —pp. 19, 20.

In illustration of the *miraculous* preservation of health and



strength to a very advanced age, in a much later period of the sacred history, Mr. Forster notices the striking declaration of Caleb to Joshua, when he claimed of him the land, which forty-five years before had been promised to him, as the reward of his faithful execution of his trust, when sent with the other spies to view the Land of Promise. "Behold," says he, "*the Lord hath kept me alive*, as he said, these forty and five years; and now, lo, I am this day *fourscore and five years old*. As yet *I am as strong this day, as I was in the day that Moses sent me*; AS MY STRENGTH WAS THEN, EVEN SO IS MY STRENGTH NOW, FOR WAR."—Josh. xiv. 10, 11. And in like manner we are told of Moses himself, that, though "an hundred and twenty years old when he died, *his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated*."—Deut. xxxiv. 7.

With respect, however, to one point, the assumption of Simon that Abimelec was *in love with* (amoureux de) Sarah, and that therefore we must suppose, "*que Dieu avoit rendu à Sara toute la beauté qu'elle avoit eue dans sa jeunesse*;" we cannot help observing, in support of Mr. Forster's argument, that it does not appear from the history, either, that it was any remarkable beauty of Sarah that influenced Abimelec, or, that he was indeed *in love with* her at all. He seems rather, according to the custom of the country, to have "sent and taken" her, almost as a matter of course, upon her arrival within his dominion. This was at least so usual, that Abraham, to all appearance, expected it as much now, as he did on a former occasion, when he went down into Egypt: and provided against any evil, which, in such a state of society, might be likely to happen to himself, by a similar stratagem. An incident of the same kind is recorded in the life of Isaac; and from the general tone of the narrative one should almost be led to imagine, that the single restriction in this respect imposed, whether by the manners or the religion of the times, on these barbarous and petty kings, was with reference to the *wife* of another; a restriction, by the way, which seems, at times, to have put the life of the husband himself in jeopardy. With such a license existing, we need hardly be surprised at any anomaly which might grow out of it, and the mere waywardness of unrestrained indulgence might, without the supposition of any *particular* attraction in the object, sufficiently account, were it necessary, or were the thing itself probably to be inferred from the narrative, even for Abimelec's assumed *love* for Sarah.

Mr. Forster may therefore well pronounce P. Simon's application of his theory of transposition to the twentieth chapter of Genesis, to be "*altogether needless*," alike "*uncalled for by the circumstances and reason of the case*."—p. 23.

But having shown it to be "*unnecessary*," he proceeds to demonstrate that it would be "*absurd*."

To render intelligible his very ingenious and most satisfactory reasoning in this part of his Essay, it will now be necessary to state, how, in the opinion of P. Simon, the dislocation of the passage, for which he contends, probably originated. This he refers to the mode in which the earlier books were written and put together. "*On écrivoit autrefois*," he observes, "*les livres sur de petites feuilles, qu'on se contentoit le plus souvent de rouler les unes sur les autres, autour d'un petit bâton, sans les coudre ensemble. Il est arrivé que comme on n'a pas eu assez de soin de conserver l'ordre de ces anciennes feuilles au rouleaux, la disposition des matières a reçu quelque changement.*"

If no other security for their preserving their right order existed, than the care which might be taken in rolling and unrolling these "*historical fragments*," for the purpose of reading or consultation, the chance of their retaining their proper stations might seem perhaps but small. Still, whatever derangement may have been subsequently introduced, at the time of composition, at least, the several portions of the history would naturally occur in their right order. It becomes the duty of a true critic, therefore, in any case of uncertainty subsequently arising, to inquire, whether or not there be any thing in the writing or composition itself, which may enable us to fix, with certainty or probability, according to the circumstances of the case, the true position of the supposed dislocated passage. It is in the discovery and application of such a verification of the place which the passage before ought to fill, and consequent justification of the actual state of the sacred text, that Mr. Forster is, we think, eminently happy. Simon does not venture to say where he would have it stand; but his argument against its present situation implies, that it must be placed "*somewhere prior to the seventeenth chapter; the latter chapter, and to verse 5 of the twenty-first inclusive, undeniably containing the occurrences of one and the same year.*" Now, that such a position of the chapter is impossible, Mr. Forster thus demonstrates :

"In the seventeenth chapter I pause upon a circumstance, minute indeed, yet among the most remarkable and most worthy of remark, of the biographical incidents connected with the history of the Father of the Faithful. I speak of the two-fold commandment given by Jehovah, in the course of this memorable interview between God and his chosen servant, that '*Abram*' and '*Sarai*' should thenceforward lay aside those names, received from man, and derived through heathen ancestors, and should receive and adopt other names, conferred on them by the voice of the Most High God, and imposed by the present ministration of Heaven. '*And Abram* fell on his face; and God talked with him, saying: As for

me, behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations. Neither shall thy name be any more called *Abram*; but thy name shall be ABRAHAM: for a father of many nations have I made thee.' (Gen. xvii. 3—5.) 'And God said unto ABRAHAM, As for *Sarai* thy wife, thou shalt not call her name *Sarai*, but SARAH shall her name be.' (Gen. xvii. 15.)

"The proverbial reverence of the ancient Jewish copyists for the integrity of the sacred text, (a reverence which, to this day, sets at defiance all imputation of wilful deliberate falsification of MSS. in the execution of their task,) is matter of unquestioned notoriety. But if ever there was an occasion more imperative than another for the exercise of this reverential accuracy of transcription, it may unhesitatingly be placed in the religious preservation of the distinction between the humanly-bestowed and the divinely-appointed names of the Father and the Mother of the faithful. *The single letters* added in the one instance (אברהם), and substituted in the other (שרי שרה), by the instant commandment of Jehovah, *must* have acquired and retained, in the eyes of Jewish piety and patriotism, on every principle of conscience and prepossession of the heart, which characteristically distinguished *the Israelite* from the rest of mankind, a value and a sacredness incommunicably and unchangeably their own.

"In the controverted narrative of the present twentieth chapter of Genesis, the divinely-enlarged name ABRAHAM, and the divinely-altered name SARAH, recur, the former in eight, the latter in five, several examples. The theoretical translocation proposed for our adoption, in this instance, by P. Simon, will require that we throw back this twentieth chapter to a place in the sacred history *certainly* prior to the seventeenth. But the seventeenth chapter, we have seen, contains the record of that interview in which Almighty God imposed their prophetic and spiritual names on his chosen servant and handmaiden: consequently, in order to the establishment of P. Simon's hypothesis of an accidental translocation of Gen. xx., we are driven upon the monstrous assumption, that *by the Jewish transcribers*, within the compass of a single chapter, the integrity of the sacred text, in one of its most sacred and inviolable features, has been wilfully and deliberately invaded and violated through a series of THIRTEEN DISTINCT EXAMPLES,—has been *wilfully and deliberately* invaded and violated, in five instances by literal substitutions, and in eight instances by literal additions."—pp. 24—27.

A more complete refutation of an unfounded, though plausible theory, than that contained in the above extract, will not easily be found in the annals of theological controversy, nor perhaps a more effectual warning against the "wanton attempts" of Simon and his followers, "to make order give place to confusion, fact to hypothesis, the sacred truth of history to the fallacies of a daring speculation."—p. 27.

But it is time to turn to the second of the two Essays, in which Mr. Forster considers the connexion between the prophecy of Jeremiah, (ch. xxxi. 15.) with respect to the voice of weeping



heard in Ramah, and the account given by St. Matthew (ch. ii.) of the slaughter of the Innocents at Bethlehem. The view taken by Mr. Forster of this connexion is, we believe, original; and even those who, with ourselves, find difficulty in subscribing to this interpretation of St. Matthew's allusion, will have none, we think, in admitting its ingenuity, or the ability with which every suggestion in its favour is brought forward. The point which Mr. Forster endeavours to establish will be best understood from his own statement of his hypothesis.

"It appears to me," says the learned writer, "to be a very inadequate mode of considering the present subject, to refer our inquiries to the prophecy of Jeremiah, and to the event which this prophecy is understood to have immediately predicted, without reverting at the same time to the historical incident on which the prophecy, Jer. xxxi. 15, 16, was grounded. For, I think, it can be satisfactorily shown, that the historical incident, Gen. xxxv. 16—19, whence the prophecy was evidently deduced, is itself a direct *type*, *not* of the event immediately referred to by Jeremiah, but of that to which St. Matthew applies the prophet's prediction; which prediction, in my apprehension, constitutes a middle term and a connecting link between the original historical type and the event in which the historical type found its literal fulfilment. I therefore consider the application by St. Matthew of Jer. xxxi. 15, to the murder of the Innocents, as an adjudgment which *authoritatively* establishes the connexion between the death-bed of Rachel (Gen. xxxv. 16—19.) and the massacre at Bethlehem (Matt. ii. 16.) as the *type* and *anti-type*."—pp. 32, 33.

The passage in Genesis, to which allusion is here made, is as follows:—

"And they (Jacob and his family) journeyed from Bethel; and there was but a little way to come to Ephrath; and Rachel travailed, and she had hard labour. And it came to pass, when she was in hard labour, that the midwife said unto her, Fear not, thou shalt have this son also. And it came to pass, as her soul was in departing, (for she died,) that she called his name Benoni (marginal reading, "the son of my sorrow,"): but his father called him Benjamin (marginal reading, "the son of the right hand,"). And Rachel died, and was buried in the way to Ephrath, which is Bethlehem."

And Mr. Forster's notion is—

"that Jeremiah diverted, from its proper object, to his immediate purpose, the prophetic type, Gen. xxxv. 16—19, in the way of *accommodation*; and that St. Matthew, by referring the prediction, Jer. xxxi. 15, to the massacre at Bethlehem, for its true fulfilment, has accomplished the final design of the Holy Spirit, in permitting the temporary discussion of the foregoing place of Genesis by the Prophet, viz., the authoritative re-union of this prophetic type with its real anti-type, through the medium



of a prophecy, couched in terms sufficiently affecting, to do justice to the deeply tragical event, to which it was meant, ultimately, to be applied."—p. 34.

In the establishment of this theory, Mr. Forster is, we think, less successful than in his refutation of P. Simon's hypothesis. As a specimen of ingenious criticism, the present Essay is not indeed inferior to the former; and its consideration would open a large field of various and not uninteresting discussion. But the length to which we have been carried in our notice of the Essay on Gen. xx. prevents our doing more in reference to that before us, than present its results to our readers, which we will do in the words, in which Mr. Forster himself "briefly recapitulates the heads of his analysis;" referring them to the book itself for the fuller development of his argument.

"1. BETHLEHEM is the scene of the historical type, Gen. xxxv. 16—19; but the scene, in its prophetical application, Jer. xxxi. 15—17, is laid in RAMAH. The *proximate* accomplishment of the prophecy, accordingly, took place at Ramah: but BETHLEHEM, and not RAMAH, is the scene of the *remote* fulfilment, both of the intermediate prophecy, and of the original historical type.

"2. The subject of the original type is, Rachel, at the point of death, weeping over *her infant son*. The subject of the intermediate prophecy is, Rachel weeping for her children, '*because they were not*.' In the *proximate* accomplishment of the prediction of Jeremiah, Rachel is only the emblem of Judea, weeping over her captive people, who were yet alive, of every sex and age. In the *remote* fulfilment of both type and prophecy, Rachel is the representative of the bereaved *mothers* of Bethlehem, weeping for *their slaughtered infant sons*.

"3. A principal incident of the historical type is, the death of Rachel: Rachel, in the history, dies, as it were, in place of her son Benjamin, in the vicinity of Bethlehem Ephrath. A principal incident of the intermediate prophecy answering to this, is the death of Rachel's children. Both incidents are without parallel, in the *proximate* accomplishment of the prediction, Jer. xxxi. 15—17. But, in the *remote* fulfilment of the prophecy, and of the prophetical type, a striking parallel to both incidents is presented; in the death of the Bethlehemitish male-children, whom Herod slew in the neighbourhood of that city; and who died, as it were, in the place of the infant Messiah, even as Rachel had died, in the stead of Benjamin her son.

"4. Another leading incident of the history is, the unexpected preservation, from a premature death, of the infant Benjamin. This incident is, in substance, preserved in the prophecy; but in the *proximate* application of the prophecy, it means no more than the preservation of the Jewish people, during the captivity. While, in the *remote* fulfilment, both of the type and the prophecy, it is literally accomplished, in the miraculous preservation, from a premature death, of the holy child, Jesus.

"5. The son of Rachel was named, 1. 'Benoni,' or, 'the Son of my Sorrow;' and, 2. 'Benjamin,' or, 'the Son of the Right Hand:' he was, consequently, (the *general* typical of the two transactions being always understood,) a prophetic type of Him, who was hereafter to be born also in Bethlehem. For Christ was, 1. 'a man of Sorrow,' and, 2. 'the man of God's right hand;' and, consequently, stands in the strict relation of anti-type to the Son of Rachel, whose two-fold name he bears. This remarkable coincidence, (which, so far as I can find, has escaped the commentators,) is peculiar to the original passage of Genesis, and the fulfilment in the Gospel.

"6. In the history, Rachel, the mother of 'Benoni,' or, 'Benjamin,' the prophetic type of the Messiah, was conducted by her husband, Jacob, to the entrance of Bethlehem, on the eve of the birth of her Son. In the Gospel, Mary, the mother of Christ, the true anti-type of 'Benjamin,' or, 'Benoni,' was, in like manner, conducted to Bethlehem, by her husband Joseph, on the eve of the nativity of our Blessed Lord.

"7. The promise to Rachel, in the prophecy of Jeremiah, is, 'they' (thy children) 'shall come again from the land of the enemy.' This promise, it is true, was, in part, fulfilled in a *proximate* accomplishment of the prediction, by the return of the children of the captivity, in the third generation, from *Babylon*. But, in the *remote* accomplishment of the prophecy of Jeremiah, the prophetic promise to Rachel was more literally, and far more transcendantly fulfilled, in the return of the child Jesus, the great anti-type of her son, Benjamin, from *the land of Egypt*.

"Lastly.—In the historical type, Rachel, when herself at the point of death, is encouraged 'not to fear,' by the consideration that her child, Benjamin, should live. In the intermediate prophecy, she is, in like manner, cheered in her last moments, by a similar assurance,—'there is hope in mine end, saith the Lord, that thy children shall come free.' Which prophetic assurances could supply (to the Rachel of the Prophet especially) adequate grounds of consolation, only as pointing prospectively to the Advent, the miraculous preservation, and the coming again out of Egypt, of 'the Hope of Israel,' of 'Him who should be born in Bethlehem of Judea, King of the Jews.'

It is impossible to shut our eyes to the felicity of many of the coincidences thus traced between the history of the birth of Benjamin, and that of our Lord's nativity. In the drawing out of the parallel, we easily recognise the same hand, which has elsewhere so ably illustrated the resemblance between Moses, and "that prophet like unto himself," of whom Moses spake.\* But neither can we conceal from ourselves, that there are many circumstances, which, on a closer inspection, prevent our giving that full assent to Mr. Forster's hypothesis, to which, at first sight, it may seem entitled. Into the statement of these, however, we cannot now enter; they will probably suggest themselves to many, who,

\* See "Discourses principally on Subjects of Scripture History, by the Reverend Charles Forster, B.D."

like ourselves, are far from looking with a friendly eye on that theory of accommodation, the application of which, in a particular instance, Mr. Forster's elucidation of the passage before us is intended to supersede. At the same time we are free to admit, that among those, whose minds revolt at the seeming difficulties of the literal interpretation of St. Matthew's language, the hypothesis of Mr. Forster will probably obtain a more favourable reception, than with those, whose judgments are in some degree affected by their comparative insensibility to those difficulties. To us it appears, (and the very attention we have given to Mr. Forster's Essay has only confirmed us in this view of the subject,) that it is far more difficult to reconcile what is called the proximate accomplishment of the prophecy with the words in which it is delivered, than to account for the introduction of the prophecy, where it stands, upon the supposition of its direct allusion to the event recorded by St. Matthew. In the explanation of that allusion we look, not to the intention of Jeremiah, to which alone the advocates of the theory of accommodation refer, and would confine us, but to the intention of the Holy Spirit, of which we conceive the declaration of St. Matthew to be an authoritative exposition; and which on this as on other occasions, we believe to have suggested the use of expressions, the full sense and scope of which was little apprehended by the prophets who uttered them. But we forbear, and in taking leave of our acute and learned Essayist, we have only to express our regret that, in travelling towards the same object, even the best friends will sometimes differ in the selection of the road.

---

ART. IV.—*Cæsar and God; a Sermon preached in the Parish Church of St. Martin, in Leicester, on Thursday, Sept. 21, 1826, before the Worshipful the Mayor and Corporation, previously to the Election of the Mayor for the Year ensuing.* By Edward Thomas Vaughan, M.A., Vicar of St. Martin's, Leicester, and Rector of Foston, Leicestershire. Leicester, T. Combe and Son. London, Baldwin and Co. 1826. pp. 68.

WHEN Dr. Sacheverell had astounded the Whiggish ears of the good citizens of London, by his well-known Fifth-of-November Sermon, Sir Samuel Garrard, the then Lord Mayor, whom Toland characterized, with much aptitude, as "a person of moderate wit, but a Tory in the highest degree," in an evil hour to himself, proposed to the assembled Court of Aldermen, that the obnoxious Discourse should be printed and the Preacher should be thanked, both at the expense of the Corporation. Never,



from the moment in which the Fallen Archangel encountered "a dismal universal hiss" when he anticipated "high applause," from the throats of his consulting Peers, were hopes more bitterly dashed. The motion was rejected with indignation, and the Preacher was reduced to—publish for himself.

But it was upon this very defeat that all Sacheverell's future fame (and no one ever had more in his generation) was established. He *did* publish for himself, *at the command* (as his Preface informs us) of the aforesaid Lord Mayor. A hot-headed and injudicious Impeachment followed; and the Kingdom was in a blaze, from Tweed-mouth to the Land's-End, in defence of the High-Church Champion. Broken windows and broken heads, mixed with all the other whims, humours, and fantasies, which distinguish an English mob, ensued in rapid succession: If the Queen set foot out of her Palace, her equipage was surrounded by an eager rabble, deafening the Royal ears with shouts of "God bless your Majesty! We hope your Majesty is for Dr. Sacheverell!" Chapels were assailed; Effigies of the odious Managers in the Commons were publicly committed to the flames; Dissenters were hooted through the streets like mad dogs; and the march of the condemned Doctor, through remote districts of the Island, was a perpetual triumph and a continued festivity. As a contemporary observed,

*Per Graiūm populos, mediasque per Elidis urbes  
Ibat exans, Dicūmque sibi poscebat honores.*

But it is not every Preacher who meets with his deserts. Not all have the good fortune to find themselves summoned in person to answer at the Bar of the Honourable House of Commons, nor can boast of having their Sermons (however worthy of such distinction) burned by the hands of the Common Hangman. And this may arise, in part, from the more gentle and complying nature of our modern Bodies Corporate. The Worshipful the Mayor, the Mayor Elect, the Aldermen, the Common Councilmen, and the other Members of the Ancient and Loyal Borough of Leicester, are men of another guise from that which marked their London brethren, A.D. 1709. They have taken upon themselves earnestly to request Mr. Vaughan, to print and publish the "very able and excellent Sermon," now before us; and, not content with testifying their approbation through a barren *Imprimatur*, they have moreover drawn upon the Corporation Revenues to defray the charges of Foolscap and Hot-pressing.

Mr. Vaughan, as we believe, is well known in his immediate neighbourhood as a very Zealous Minister. He writes himself "Vicar of St. Martin's, Leicester, and Rector of Foston, Lei-



cestershire;" and hence we deduce (whatever misgivings might otherwise assail us) that he has sometime been ordained according to the rites of the Church of England, and therefore, that he has subscribed her Articles. His former publications are neither very bulky nor very numerous. The chief appear to be some Essays, entitled *The Truth*, Nos. I. II. III. IV. V. VI. VII. VIII. at 6*d.* each; and a tolerably thickish Octavo, *The Calvinistic Clergy defended, and the Doctrine of Calvin maintained*. But his *magnum opus*, and, as we doubt not, that upon which he mainly hopes to build his permanent Theological reputation, is this very laudable and Mayor-exhorting Discourse which he pronounced on the last Festival of St. Matthew.

Our task, in reviewing this Sermon, must be confined almost wholly to the display of passages; for in itself it admits neither of exposition nor of paraphrase, nor can it be elucidated by any commentary. *Magister Vaughan et sui amici sunt tales qui inquirunt secreta Scripturarum, quæ non possunt intelligi ab omnibus, nisi qui sunt illuminati a Domino*. He plunges, at one step, into the vast profound of his own peculiar Divinity; and those who are unable to ascertain, from himself, the precise meaning of his idiomatic language, must seek for it in vain elsewhere. How far we are among this number it is irrelevant to our present purpose to avow: thus much, however, we may unscrupulously state, that Mr. Vaughan has astonished us; that we regard him with unfeigned admiration; and that we consider his Intellect to spring from a hitherto unparalleled generation. It must have been begotten, unless we greatly mistake, by a cross between the pseudo-spiritualism of Swedenborg and the metaphysico-mystification of Kant.

From *Matthew*, xxii. 21. Mr. Vaughan first explains the circumstances under which the injunction was given of rendering to Cæsar and God their separate things. Our Lord, it seems, had "three distinct rencontres with the Pharisees;" He "cut his crafty venomous interrogators to the heart;" and He "sprang a countermine upon his antagonists" when they sought to entrap him in discourse. But as Mr. Vaughan uses his own translation of the Bible, in preference to the authorized version (a practice now and then of infinite convenience), it is but fair that we should put our readers in possession of the precise words upon which his reasoning is grounded: and this, indeed, is the more necessary, for otherwise there would be some occasions on which they might be somewhat at a loss in recognizing the Scriptures to which they are accustomed, under their new costume. "Then the Pharisees, having gone forth, consulted together how they may have entrapped him in discourse," (*ὅπως αὐτὸν παγιδεύσω-σιν*;) *Matt.* xxii. 15. "Having gone forth," we are told, "implies

that they left their own houses severally, and met together by concert and appointment." Now we think that Mr. Vaughan, notwithstanding his extensive Biblical labours, will be puzzled to find an authority for such a paraphrase of the very simple word *πορεύεσθαι*; which, in good truth, in this place, means no other than *having gone away* or *departed*; *sc.* from the presence of Jesus, who had before, as we are told, been addressing them. On the *past* sense, which Mr. Vaughan *invariably* affixes to the Aorists, all comment would be thrown away. He proceeds, "are we at liberty to *have paid*" (*δοῦναι*, to be in the habit of paying) "the Census to Cæsar." "*Shall we have given or shall we not have given?*" (*δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν*. Matt. xxii. 17.)—"But Jesus having known *their maliciousness in this particular*," (*πονηρίαν*. "The very term which the sacred writers use to denote the Devil, the evil, or wicked, or *specially diseased*, or *painful*, or *mischievous one*,") answered them as in the Text.

"Thus their enterprize failed; they thought they held him enclosed as between the horns of a dilemma: if he should flee from Cæsar, he would spike himself upon the populace, whose favor was at present so formidable to them; if he fled from the people he would butt against Cæsar."—pp. 23, 24.

And hence arises the question, whether God has invested Cæsar with authority? That he has done so is proved by the following induction. God has accepted a substitute for the annihilation of his offending creatures; and it was his wisdom so to do for these plain reasons: because—

"the sustained devil is a witness for God's being, not only as His agent in temptation—a lying spirit in the mouth of His prophets, a bringer-out of latent evil in His chosen, and a hardener of His reprobates—but in his own personal condition; in his powerless powers and in his joyless enjoyments, in his wisdom turned to craft and his knowledge to misery. And how much more we, in our sustainment, who not only resemble the Devil, our chosen lord and master, in our perverted faculties, in our shame and in our wretchedness, but, through our peculiar constitution have afforded Him the opportunity of taking very union with the creature in its sin and ruin, and, by reintegration of it as the subject of sovereignly imposed distinctions, giving the last and irrefragable proof that He is and there is none beside Him. An end, which some may deem unmeaning, as not discerning that God, who delights in communicating of his good, cannot, till he has made his being, just such as it is known: a plan, which some may deem unnecessary, as not discerning that he who is inapprehensible to any sense, to every sense, and incomprehensible to any, to every finite, that is, every creature intellect, must by project and arrangement, and those of such a kind as to constrain the recognition, effect it. And what shall constrain this re-

cognition, but a project which precludes the possibility of supposing the first great cause of being to be inherent in the creature itself? And what shall preclude that possibility, but a scheme which unites curse with blessing, conservation with destruction, the ruin of the whole with the reproduction of the whole, resurrection of life and resurrection of damnation? Nor let it be overlooked, that, whilst our earth and those beings immediately connected with it are object large enough to call for such a demonstration of God's being—demonstration which shall compel the assent of the unbelieving despiser as well as confirm the faith of the satisfied expectant—our earth is but as a speck in the horizon to the system of the universe, and it may be that we are destined to teach the elements of the knowledge of God to other worlds as well as our own.”—pp. 30—32.

“ Now, if the dissolution of the twofold continuity of man, nay, of the whole creation as being connected with him, after having maintained it in its primary state for a while, together with its re-production after a while in a new form, unto a new kind of being and under new relations, amidst eternal arbitrary distinctions of shame and glory, bliss and misery, splendor and darkness, be in fact God's substitute for that annihilation which we have seen to be the sinning creature's due; if this whole substitution, commencing palpably with the Fall, but fixed and settled as that which should infallibly come out of it or ever a stone of the world was laid, had its basis in Christ only; in Christ, as able, and alone able, to sustain the edifice of a world saved from just and due annihilation by his making of himself part of it, and, as the fit recompence of his deed, receiving the entire dominion of it; if such be the moral condition of the governed creature, and such its relations to God, to Christ, and to its component elements; what becomes of all those man-exalting theories concerning the origin, nature and end of civil government, by which power is traced to the people as its source, submission made matter of choice and compact, and the governed the tribunal of the governor? As there is no power but of God, so is there no power of God but what is laid up in, derived from, and amenable for its exercise to, Christ only. As God is no anarchist, and man not only evil, but specially a rebel—an unwilling, discontented, turbulent subject—he must have the ruler's eye upon him continually. As he believes not what he sees not, that eye must be a visible one: even the Jews, with God's king avowedly at their head, and set out to them as bearing that office in all their ordinances, called for a king, as though they had not one; because they saw not one. As the re-produced Head cannot, either in his predestinated or realized elevation, be of the same form with the as yet undissolved material of the world which he has earned and received, and cannot therefore be visible, or in any wise sensible to sensible substances; as his life must be different, his presence reserved, his communications select; he must exercise his headship by a Vicegerent. There must be a Cæsar, in short, a sensible head of rule, in the person of either one or many. *Necessary* government implies *restraint and imposition*, not indulgence and flattery, as its characteristic properties. The Universal King must universally be the



ultimate object of rule and justice, that all may know, own, and serve Him. Here is seen the just and unalienable alliance between the Church and the State; ridiculed, as it is, by the profane, perverted by the selfish. The State exists for the Church; the Church overshadows the State. If Cæsar loll on his throne because he has Christ for its supporter, he forsakes his office; but that throne has no other real support than the unseen Rock, and the unseen Rock has its aptest and most efficacious witness in the visible throne which throws back all its glory and honor upon Him."—pp. 33—36.

Upon these grounds, although Mr. Vaughan rejoices in his heart that the land of his nativity is the seat of a limited monarchy, although he is delighted in the possession of *Magna Charta*, and thanks God for the securities of the bloodless Revolution, yet he "could not have fought at Runnymede," where there never was any battle; and he "must have hesitated to take a seat in the Convention Parliament," into which he was not eligible.

Far beyond that most obsequious Prelate, who, as it is recorded, assured James I. that he might take all the money of his subjects, since he was the breath of their nostrils, Mr. Vaughan contends that to *take* it is not by any means necessary, for that it already belongs to the King; not only as once levied in benevolences and subsidies, or, according to the more modern practices, in customs, assessed taxes, and stamp duties, but at the very moment in which the bullion is transferred from the coffers of the Bank in Lothbury to the Presses of the Mint on Tower Hill.

"When you see your King's head upon a crown piece, surmounted with his style, what does this declare to you? What, but that the current coin, every sovereign and every penny, is truly and properly his? Why, is it not his if it derives all its value from him? I cannot give value to that which is not mine, and it is plain the King's head gives its value to that paltry substance which has worth to procure all the necessities of life for me. What is it without his stamp; and what right has he to stamp it? Evidently, his right is his supremacy, his power of saying, I will; and where that power is exerted, it is manifested to be. All the currency of the kingdom, then, is the King's, and if you or I possess a shilling, it is because the King has given it us; and if we possess a piece of paper, whether from the Government bank, or from a private company, which fetches something, it is because the King has given the issuers leave to use their credit. Then, if Cæsar calls for tribute, he calls for that which has been his, and which he has given to me, but given with the understanding that when he wanted it he should have it again. It matters not, you perceive, whether it be the denarius, or a piece of paper, or a bale of goods, in which the tribute is paid; the worth of each resolves itself into Cæsar's word. He condescends to receive the paper, or the goods, as the substitute for that which tells his right to it. Well might Jesus say, "Give back."—pp. 40, 41.

According to this principle, not only his Majesty and the Duke



of Wellington among living men, but the Marquess of Granby and the King of Prussia among the defunct, the Turk and Saracen among the unbelievers, and, in the wide circle of equivocal generation, Blue Lions and Green Dragons, Spread Eagles, Swans with two necks, *et hoc genus omne*, each in himself is undoubted sole proprietor of his own respective head, whenever he chances to meet with it emblazoned on a sign post.

Next for the rendering to God.

“ It is the fashion to suppose that all men, promiscuously and without exception, have whereof to render ; and that their offerings, even without the intermediation of any other substance of their own, if sincere, as they term it, cannot fail to gain admission. But this is not true : the considerations which we have already entertained (p. 28 to 33.) evince that it is not. If every human being is born under a deserved curse of annihilation, which is commuted for dissolution with reproduction into a various state, some to shame and some to glory, is it possible that the dissolved, or waiting-to-be-dissolved substance *through* curse and *in* curse, can have any thing to offer ; or that any thing which he hath can be offered with acceptance ? Why, then, the non-entity exists ; or, more correctly, the scattered, whose elements have been separated far as earth from hell, as pole from pole, remains one substance : nay, whom God hath spoken ill to, unto the severment of their constituent parts, He still counts worthy.

“ I do not charge false teachers and false worshippers with the full monstrosity of their doctrine : it is hidden from them. If they really saw, could they go on thus to contradict and insult God ? Virtually He has dissolved even now, because he could do no less, the substance which hath denied His being ; and this substance comes before Him as though it had done nothing amiss : for to talk of amissness to God which is not followed by destruction is to make him such an one as ourselves, who may offend each other and shake hands—or one of the parties *say*, I am very sorry—and they are as good friends as ever. God is not so mocked ; *his* injuries of every kind and degree are a conflict *ad interfectionem*—to the extermination of the offenders. The truth, meanwhile, that God has found a way in which his dissolved ones for whom he has prepared a blessed reproduction may stand up in his presence as reproduced before the time. Not only has he by predestination conformed them to the image, that is, to the outside, or visible part, the body, of his Son before all worlds, and, as so conformed, received them into the number of his true, accepted, eternal servants and worshippers, but He has also devised instruments varied some little in appearance, but always essentially the same, by which to put his foreknown, elect and predestinated ones into an *as it were* present possession of the benefit ; thus enabling them, even in the days of their flesh, and, whilst yet waiting for their dissolution, ‘ to present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, as their reasonable service.’ (Rom. xii. 1.)”  
—pp. 46—48.

“ But this hindereth not that the truly reproduced man, he in whom

the Spirit of the reproduction, say rather, in whom Christ, by and in the person of that Spirit, is, do enter into the bliss and power and glory of that state. Every such person, whether it be in the article of Baptism; or before, or long afterwards, that he have received the gift of the person of the Holy Ghost to dwell and walk in him, is taught to ascribe his gift to that ordinance, and to deal with himself, and with all other substances, as though he were *completely* reproduced (being really so *in part*) into the new creation state, as one of its Kings and Priests in Christ Jesus. (Revel. i. 6.) This is what I venture to characterize as the state of "realized baptism," *an as it were* resurrection whilst we are yet in the body."—pp. 49, 50.

One only point now remains untouched: namely, to show the connection between rendering to Cæsar and to God: and in this there is but little difficulty; for the power of the one is manifestly derived from that of the other. Scripture on very many occasions exhibits this connection.

"Peter's advice to the elect dispersion-strangers is, 'Have been subjected, therefore, to every human creation (or, *constitution*) on account of the Lord; whether to the King, as super-eminent, or to leaders, as being in sending by him to the taking of vengeance upon evil-doers, and to the praise of good doers. For this is God's will, that by doing good we make dumb the ignorance of senseless men. As being free men, yet not having this liberty as the covering of our wickedness, but as being the servants of God. Be about to show respect to all men. Love the community of the Brotherhood. Fear God. Show respect to the King.' (1 Pet. ii. 13—17.) His fore-announcement concerning the wrath to come is, that, as 'the Lord knoweth how to reserve the unjust until the day of judgment, that they may be punished, *so especially he knows how to reserve* those who walk behind the flesh in pollution lust (*lust which pollutes it*), and who despise lordship. Daring persons, pleasers of self, they do not tremble at blaspheming glories (*persons of distinction*).' (2 Pet. ii. 9, 10.) Jude describes the same objects of judgment; 'In like manner, truly, these also in their dreaming pollute the flesh on the one hand, and on the other make a nothing of lordship, and, farther, blaspheme (*rail at*) glories.' (Jude 8.) Paul, moreover, the prince of the witnesses on this subject, who apologizes for having given a disrespectful name to God's High Priest, when under arraignment before the council, (see p. 57.) commands thus: 'Let every soul rank itself under the super-eminent authorities. For there is not an authority except from God; but the existing authorities have been ordained by God. So that he who sets himself in array against the authority, hath stood out against the distributive arrangement of God. But they who stand out shall receive condemnation to themselves. For the rulers are not a dread to the works which are good, but to the works which are evil. But art thou willing not to dread authority? Do what is good, and thou shalt have praise from it. For he is a God minister, to thee unto what is good. But if thou doest that which is evil, dread. For he doth not carry the sword idly. For he is a God minister, an

avenger, unto wrath to him that doeth what is evil. Wherefore there is a necessity for you to subject yourself, not only on account of the wrath (*which is impending,*) but also on account of your conscience. For on this account ye even pay tribute. For they are God's office-bearers, acting strength in their office unto this very thing. Give back therefore to all men their dues: to him who hath the due of tribute (*tax from produce*), tribute; to him who hath the due of custom (*tax upon exports and imports*), custom; to whom dread, dread; to whom respect, respect."—pp. 59—61.

In the last proof upon which Mr. Vaughan relies we do not altogether coincide with him. But, perhaps, as he uses a private version of the Bible, he may also employ a *corrected* Edition of the Liturgy.

"The Occasional Offices distinctly recognize the election, ordination, institution and unction of the sovereign by God himself, his right to the hearts of his people, and his sons' and sons' sons' rights after him, in the order of primogeniture. The appropriations made in that for the Martyrdom are hyberbolical in the extreme, if Charles were not the Vicegerent and Representative of Jesus. How else can the murder at Whitehall be deplored as a repetition of the treason acted on Mount Calvary, and the phrenzy with which England embued her hands with the blood of a mere human monarch be made the parallel of that infatuation to which the Jews were given up as the fruit and summit of the great and long provocations of their sins?"—pp. 62, 63.

In our copies, the Occasional Office for the 30th of January no where deplores the murder of Charles I. "as a repetition of the Treason acted on Mount Calvary." It does indeed (and most truly) represent the pious King as "following the steps of his blessed Master and Saviour," in the meek endurance of barbarous indignities, and of praying for his murderers, "according to the same pattern." But in this very natural, very just, and very Scriptural language, we see nothing of that unseemly and irreverent approximation of the Martyr to his Redeemer which has been the coinage of Mr. Vaughan's fancy. Has he forgotten that most extraordinary coincidence by which the Second Lesson for the day, read by Bishop Juxon to the King, but a few hours before he ascended the Scaffold, contained in it the narrative of our Saviour's Crucifixion, as related in *Matt.* xxvii.?

Mr. Vaughan's powers of ratiocination have been amply exhibited above; a single specimen of his sublimity must suffice in conclusion.

"Now, therefore, what remains but that I solemnly commend this subject to your most serious attention? In addressing the Mayor and Corporation of this ancient and loyal Borough as a preparation for the annual election of their Chief Magistrate, I do a work of Cæsar and of



God: Cæsar must have his subordinates; even as God has his Cæsar. There are many magistracies, but one Magistrate; he who wears the crown the chief of the visible, but the hidden sceptre-bearer God's delegated Chief of All. What subject, then, so suitable to the occasion, as that which gives origin to the occasion; God's transfer of his power to the second Person of his substance, made empty, made a creature: who being unseen must be represented by seen ones: to whom therefore, by his Constitutor's will, he transmits a portion of his authority; to Cæsar variously divided; to you, my honored Sirs, as well as to the King. What better preparation for the exercise of your authority, than to be reminded whence it comes, and how and why?—May God bless you in revolving these things! Know, my friends, that no part of His truth standeth alone; no part is intelligible alone; to know any thing you must know all things; to know Cæsar you must know Christ. It is my fervent hope that both you, and others through you, will be led into that searching of the Scriptures to know for yourselves 'the things of Cæsar' which shall issue in you obtaining a spiritual understanding of 'the things of God;' the things which make God known; which He revealeth to whom He will by his Spirit; which are foolishness to the natural man, but to him that is taught of God, wisdom and peace!

“What a proof we have of man's native stolidity and stubbornness in the insensibility with which he overlooks and spurns his teachers! I speak not of oral, or of written teachers—whose cry and claim to be heard is more impetuous, and the impending vengeance of their neglect, therefore, still more tremendous—but of the speaking signs with which God surrounds him. Who, almost, sees God in the small mite of the sun-beam, hears Him in the soft zephyr, magnifies Him in the stupendous frame of his own body, and cries out for Him, as needed to satisfy them, in the consciousness of the capacities of his soul? Even the pomp and pageant of Cæsar is affecting: how much more his wrath, which is as the roaring of a lion; his voice when it inflicts death! Yet does any stop to inquire, whilst the procession passes by, Whence came those lictors with the fasces? By what authority doth man judge man? Who gave to one who is no more than my fellow in nature that robe which adorns, and that sword which makes him terrible? If these questions were humbly and solicitously asked, there would in no long time come a voice from the excellent glory, 'This is my beloved Son, hear him. The pageant which thou sawest is the emblem of a state not yet formed, of a throne not yet disclosed; the manifestation moreover, and a part of the agency, of an empire which is even now maintaining itself, and which hath conducted all things from the beginning: whose seat is the right hand of God, and whose head is the Lord of glory—He that hath come and shall come again.' Then who am I, will the trembling inquirer say, that I should abide the day of his coming? that I should stand when he appeareth? 'Thou doest well to tremble. Such trembling is the paroxysm which prepareth the frame for peace; encourage it by acquainting thyself better with thine own self, thy origin, thy woes, thy heart. And when thou hast lien prostrate for a while, self-emptied;



self-despairing, I will acquaint thee with my Jesus; thou shalt know him, thou shalt believe in him; thou shalt know him, thou shalt love him; and not him only but Me *out of* whom he came, and *from* whom he came, and *to* whom he hath returned; Whose he is, and Whom he serveth, and Whom thou shalt know, and confess, and serve with him: I AM speaketh to thee.'"—pp. 65—67.

If this be not fine writing where is fine writing to be found? *aut hic aut nusquam est*. Such an union of the sonorous and the substantial, of the glowing and the grave, of rotundity of mouth and profundity of bottom, is not of frequent occurrence. It would be well worth a journey to Leicester to be present at a similar delivery; and if this be the vein in which Mr. Vaughan appeals to the ears of the groundlings and the gallery-sitters, as often as he mounts the pulpit, we cannot wish too fervently—

That when he next doth preach again,  
We may be there to hear!

---

ART. V.—*Sermons, chiefly designed to display the Connection between a sound Faith and a holy Life.* By the Rev. Edward Patteson, M.A. of East Sheen, Surrey; formerly of Trinity College, Oxford. London, Rivingtons. 1826. 1 vol. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ADDISON, has somewhere remarked, that “good writing does not consist in saying what is new, but in saying what is already known, in a new and agreeable manner.” This observation, true in every case, is especially just with respect to divinity, in which there is no important truth that is not ancient, and whatever is really new is certainly false. A preacher of the Gospel, therefore, must relinquish every attempt to engage the attention of his auditors by the novelty of his subject; he must constantly propound the same doctrines, inculcate the same precepts, and urge the same motives. And it will inevitably happen that these topics, notwithstanding their tremendous importance, will, by their constant recurrence, return with less and less interest: this is a great disadvantage, and it is a disadvantage with which the ministers of Christianity will, for the reasons we have just given, find it more difficult to contend than any other persons whose office it is to speak frequently in public. They who plead at the bar, they who harangue in the senate, have it always in their power, from the very nature of their subjects, to secure the attention, by gratifying the curiosity, of their hearers; because their efforts are seldom excited upon things which by their constant use are brought

into a stale and unaffecting familiarity; some degree of novelty must be one of the materials in every instrument which is designed to work upon the human mind, for curiosity blends itself more or less with all our passions. This difficulty is felt by the clergy, some of whom, in their endeavours to diminish or overcome it, have adopted a style little suited to the gravity of their character; or to the dignity of their subject; a style at once flippant, turgid, and declamatory, which strives to conceal the poverty of meaning with the tinsel finery of verbiage. We have long thought that a florid sermon is the least difficult of all literary compositions, while a plain and unadorned discourse, which has the power to arrest the attention of the hearers, is the production of a sound judgment and extensive information.

We are happy to have it in our power to confirm and illustrate this opinion by the excellent collection of sermons which are now before us. The purity and elegance of the style, the closeness and accuracy of the reasoning, the clearness of arrangement, the soundness of doctrine, and, above all the rest, the vein of genuine, unaffected, and glowing piety, which runs through the whole volume, give it a claim to general attention.

The collection consists of twenty sermons; the leading object of which, as the title indicates, is to display the connection between a sound faith and a holy life.

The first sermon is "on the Inefficacy of Nominal Religion." In this discourse the learned writer expatiates with considerable ability on Jer. viii. 22. "Is there no balm in Gilead; is there no physician there? why then is not the health of the daughter of my people recovered?" The next, which is equally excellent, is "on the Testimony of Conscience," from these words, "If our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things. If our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence towards God."—1 John, iii. 20, 21. The third sermon is a very superior composition: it is "on Self-Examination," from Psalm iv. 4. "Commune with your own heart, and in your chamber, and be still." If our space permitted, we would gladly transcribe some passages from this sermon, which indicate the skilful anatomist of the human heart; we give the following as a specimen of our author's style:—

"If there is any particular head of duty on which we reflect with reluctance, and from which we find ourselves repeatedly shrinking with aversion; this is but too manifest a sign that we have some favourite vices or follies which we cannot bear to look into;—some tender point in our character which we are afraid to probe. No other monition then can we require—none stronger could we receive—that this is the point, of

all others, to be investigated with the most unsparing rigour. Neither is it only what we may have actually done or said that we are bound to consider; but on what motives we have acted and spoken: for, though it is the outward act that affects our fellow-mortals, it is the intention that marks its character in the sight of God, and by which, therefore, our own judgement of it must be decided, and hence appears, in the strongest light, the necessity of subjecting thoughts, as well as deeds and words, to the scrutiny of conscience."

In the fourth sermon, (for Good Friday,) "on the Divinity of Christ," from Philippi. ii. 5. we have an instance of the literary excellence alluded to above, which consists in giving a well known subject a new and interesting aspect, by the judicious manner in which it is discussed. But as this effect can only be perceived by viewing the whole composition, we cannot convey to our readers an adequate idea of the merits of the Discourse by any brief extracts, to which our narrow limits compel us to confine ourselves.

The next sermon "on the Limits of Conformity," is an able exposition and amplification of 1 Cor. ix. 22. "I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some." The following objection is strongly stated, and triumphantly confuted:

" 'And this,' remarks the infidel, 'is the confession of an Apostle: these, if we may credit his own account, were the means by which his opinions were to be propagated, and his party strengthened, and this is the pattern which he holds out for imitation!' A most serious imputation, indeed, would this be, were there a particle of truth in it. But St. Paul, my brethren, you may safely believe and insist had no ends to be so gained. He neither professed nor recommended such detestable duplicity: nor would he have sanctioned the use of such means were the ends in view ever so laudable. The charge, in fact, like every similar charge against the first preachers of the Gospel, bears intrinsic marks of improbability. They who lie in wait to catch men for evil purposes do not usually make a display of the traps which they employ. What the Apostle here means by 'saving some,' is evidently—saving their souls from everlasting perdition, by turning them from sin to righteousness: and the methods, be assured, of which he proposed to avail himself for this truly benevolent and glorious end, could not involve the sacrifice of honour and truth. To his purpose it was essential, that he should maintain the moral dignity of his own character; and he could not but be aware, that had he set about the conversion of sinners, by flattering their follies and conforming to their vices, he would only have convinced them that he was no better than themselves. So far did he actually become 'all things to all men,' that having to do of necessity with men of various descriptions, Jews and Gentiles, nobles and plebeians, learned and illiterate, philosophers and rustics; men of lively imaginations, but defective judgement, and men of weak minds, but strong prejudices, he



thought fit to enter freely into their several notions and conceptions of things; to talk to them (if I may so express it) in their own way, and reason with them upon their own principles: and so, partly by refuting their errors upon admitted grounds; partly by giving way to harmless prepossessions; and partly by setting before them the advantages and the beauties of the Christian system, in such points of view as were best suited to their habits and capacities, to invite and guide them into the kingdom of Heaven—that is—into a cordial acceptance of the Gospel-covenant. This, in St. Paul's acceptance of the words, was 'becoming all things to all men,' that he 'might by all means save some.'

"Would to God we could now see, not only such persons as apparently devote their lives to the business of conversion, and seem to compute the value of their labours by the number of their proselytes, but even those who burn with a purer zeal for the honour of God and the advancement of religion, proceeding half so judiciously as this most ardent and zealous Apostle!"—pp.90—94.

The tenth sermon is on "the Mystery of the Holy Trinity," John, iii. 9. "Nicodemus answered and said unto him, how can these things be?" In this Discourse we find good practical inferences from this important doctrine; and we strongly recommend it to the perusal of such of our readers as desire to see how fully even the deepest mysteries of our holy faith are calculated to minister to the spiritual consolation of the humblest believer.

The eleventh sermon "on the Character of Abraham," Genesis, xxii. 6. is an instructive dissertation on a most affecting subject; and here the skill and judgment of the writer are eminently conspicuous.

In the thirteenth sermon, "The Portrait of Charity," 1 Cor. xiii. 8. we find an interpretation of 1 Peter, iv. 8. to which we cannot assent: in this the author has fallen into the error, countenanced, we admit, by many respectable authorities, that the apostle alludes to the concealment of *our own* sins; but, we submit that this exposition is not only contrary to the analogy of faith, but to the scope of the apostle's argument. No works or dispositions of ours can atone for our transgressions, and this no one knows better, or asserts more strongly, than Mr. Patteson himself; besides, the context will not admit of this interpretation. They are the sins of *others* that charity conceals; that is, conceals from the world. Assuredly, no sincere Christian will close his eyes to the sins of his neighbour, neither will it be charity in him to do so, when he considers how hateful in the sight of God all sin must be: but while he sees the sins of his neighbour, he will strive to reclaim him, and he will do this in such a way that *the world shall not know them*: this is real charity, and this is the charity *which hideth the multitude of sins*.

Here we shall conclude our remarks upon these Discourses.



To students in theology we recommend them as specimens of elegant composition, in which the important doctrines of the Gospel are strongly asserted and warmly and zealously enforced, and they will find in them an additional proof of what they cannot too frequently call to mind, that the only root from which a correct and impressive style of composition in divinity can spring, is a deep, extensive, and accurate knowledge of the Holy Scriptures.

---

ART. V. — *Reise in die Gegend zwischen Alexandrien und Parätonium, die Libysche Wüste, Siwa, Egypten, Palästina, und Syrien, in den Jahren 1820 und 1821.* Von Dr. Joh. Mart. Augustin Scholz, Professor der Theologie auf der Universität zu Bonn. Leipsic. 1822. 8vo.

THE name of Dr. Scholz has long been well known to biblical scholars, although his works have not passed beyond the German language: his *Biblical Tour* and the present work, on account of its connexion with theological inquiries, rank deservedly among the most important discoveries of modern times. We consider it consistent with our plan to attract the public notice to his labours, as we shall shortly have to devote our attention to a New Testament by this author, in which a new system of recensions and various readings, unknown to Griesbach and Matthæi, are brought to light, by means of his unwearied researches in various countries of Europe and the East.

The present series of *Travels* was undertaken under imperial auspices: Dr. Scholz sailed from Trieste to Alexandria in the month of August, 1820, making observations on manners, customs and languages, at the different places at which he touched on the voyage. He does not immediately enter into minutiae, but after enumerating his predecessors who had written on these regions, and describing the dangers to which caravans are exposed from the Bedûins, he contents himself with giving a synopsis of his travels in the first part of the book, which he amplifies and carries into detail in the sequel. The most important part in this division of his work is the table of distances, which he has given.

After the first excursion which he made from Alexandria, and his return thither, sickness prevailed among his companions, and Professor Lieman, of Berlin, died there. On the recovery of the others, he proceeded by the new canal to *Fum' el makmudyè*; and, in company with one Italian and some Arabian merchants, in three days reached Cairo in a hired vessel. Being dissuaded

from immediately visiting Nubia and Abyssinia, he was advised by the Bishop of Babylon to accompany him to Palæstine and Syria. Although he was the Roman-Catholic Bishop of all Chaldæa and Assyria, and although his diocese was very extensive, the number of Christians of his persuasion did not exceed *three thousand*.

But “the very numerous Catholics of the Chaldæan Church have their patriarchs and bishops,—those of the Syrian and Armenian churches, as well as the Maronites, have, likewise, their own bishops.”

At Cairo he employed himself in examining the most remarkable things in the city and its environs, particularly the pyramids. At *Bilbeish* he and his companions were joined by some Englishmen; and at *Saalhigeh* by five Coptic, eight Syrian, thirteen Palæstinian, and five Curdish merchants, with twelve negro-slaves, and one Indian Dervish, with an attendant, who had sold all his property, which was very considerable, in his native land, for the sake of making the pilgrimages to Mecca and Jerusalem. This devotee, for the space of four years, had migrated from place to place, and all his property having been stolen from him at Mecca, had since subsisted upon alms. In addition to these, they were joined by several travellers from *Bilbeish* and *Gaza*, so that the caravan consisted of more than 80 people, 140 camels, 1 dromedary, 30 asses, and 1 horse. During the course of this journey, the author describes the various modes of travelling adopted by these different nations, their peculiar customs, and religious duties, which we shall omit, since other writers have already treated of them most circumstantially. Having arrived at Jerusalem, he made excursions on the coast as far as *Kesserwan*; from thence he penetrated into the interior of Palæstine, and returned to Jerusalem at Easter. At first he had intended to have directed his course to *Shàm*; but, on account of the unfavourable aspect of affairs, he hastened to *Jaffa*, where he found the political consternation still greater. Two letters conclude this chapter, from which we learn, that he accompanied the Bishop of Babylon from Jerusalem to *Akka*, and explored the plains of *Sarona*, *Cæsarea*, *Tautora* and *Atlid*,—that he visited Carmel and the whole of Galilee, *Saida*, *Beirut*, *Samaria*, *Richa*, the *Dead Sea*, *Mount Karantan*, *Saba*, *Bethany*, and other memorable places in Judæa, the knowledge of which will be found important, when it shall become our task to criticise the new readings of his Testament and their sources. But the general commotion prevented him from proceeding through Samaria and Decapolis to *Shàm* and Lebanon.

From hence he animadverts on the mode and danger of travel-

ling in the East, on the impositions which are continually practised, and the expenses actually requisite to the performance of the several distances. Like many others, he observes that

“rich Englishmen have very much injured other travellers. They arrived in these regions with some thousand pounds sterling, and he who cannot now command as much, is pitied, as a *poor devil*, and scarcely considered to be worthy of attention. The Sheikhs of the country are upbraided for countenancing these impositions, yet unjustly, for the devotees in the cloisters possess an impertinence as rarely equalled. I have observed them waiting a whole day before the door of a traveller, for a large *Bakhshish*, because they had drawn his attention to some festival in the church. . . . The Armenian and Greek monks have a refined manner of indemnifying themselves for their services. They never omit giving to the foreigner one of their creatures, as a guide, who quickly gains his confidence, and acquaints him with the tax, which they account charity, conferred as alms upon the church. If the individual be rich, this tax among the Armenians often amounts to 1000 piastres for a few dinners and nights' lodgings. The Greeks ask for little, but they ask so much the more frequently in proportion. Yet the poor pilgrim receives humane treatment from them.

“In the cultivated part of Syria they travel most comfortably on mules. They carry great burdens, and run much quicker than camels. The latter are, in general, but ill adapted to the rocky mountains of Judæa. They have no firm footing, and often lie down with their load. On the coast as far as Lebanon, and in Galilee, one is secure from the attacks of robbers; but, in the other parts of Syria, the journey is always full of danger. Three years since a caravan, going from Shàm to Baghdàd; consisting of more than 100 camels, was totally plundered and murdered. Those from Shàm to Haleb are frequently surprized. The journey to Tadmor has been most perilous for a Frank, since the Bedùins of the territory were chastised by an army of the sultan for the murder of an English traveller of rank. The Nomades conceive themselves justified in these atrocities, either when they find any one in the caravan, on whom they can exercise the law of retribution (*jus talionis*) or blood wages, or when they have not agreed beforehand with them as to the payment, for which, (indeed, as for everything,) they resolve to lay actual claims on their own ground and soil. And this they often do from love of murder and rapine.”

Dr. Scholz left Jaffa in an Austrian polacca, nearly filled with Russian pilgrims, bound by Cyprus to Constantinople. Having been prevented from landing at Cyprus by a storm, the vessel was driven to Rhodes. Here they experienced the results of the war between the Turks and the Greeks; for, although they indeed received food and wine at Rhodes, they were cautioned against visiting the city, because throughout the Ottoman dominions Christians were liable, at this juncture, to be put to death by the



**Turks and Jews.** Going from one place to another, hearing everywhere contradictory accounts of the war, they found each in an absolute state of perturbation. A lively description of this universal sensation, in each part of Greece which the author visited, is subjoined, in which he has disclosed an extensive acquaintance with the politics and operations of the conflicting powers. From hence he took ship to Trieste.

Having in this synopsis described his travels by means of this singular arrangement, he now enters into particulars. We must consequently retrace his steps to the region between Alexandria and the frontiers of the Tripolitan territory, of which he has given an ample topography, carefully writing the name of each place in the Arabic character, and measuring the distances by hours. In this catalogue of places he has recorded the springs and *manzils*, and detailed the names of spots not visited by him on the authority of the Beduins. To a future traveller in these regions this information will be invaluable, and from the difficulty of ascertaining Oriental words written in our character, his attention to their Arabic orthography may, hereafter, prove of incalculable utility.

The following chapter is devoted to the natural history of the places.

“To the distance of one-eighth or one-fourth of an hour from the sea, the soil is either sandy or stony, from thence to the distance of ten or eighteen hours inland, it is clay, with very little sand or stone. In only a small part of it barley is sown in December. They turn up the light soil once with the camel, by means of a small plough, throw the seed on the earth, and harrow it into it. After three months they pluck off the ears, and immediately thresh out the corn on the field.”

In this region there are very few trees : palms, pomegranates and figs alone are noticed. Among the insects, ants, flies, dragonflies, varieties of the beetle and moths (particularly the scarabæus sacer) in great abundance, and innumerable snails were observed : coralline fragments, also, shells, spiral shells and fungus, seen on the shores, of various sizes, forms and colours, attested the vast population of the sea. Different species of green lizards, adders and snakes,—birds of prey, such as eagles, vultures, owls,—aquatic fowls, singing birds, and a vast number of Ubaras every where abounded. The Beduins understand the art of training a species of vulture or hawk, called saker, to fowling. They tame him by hunger, and, holding him over a flame of fire, hood him with a leathern cap, which they extend round the bill, so that he may be able to eat, while at the time of fowling, they contract the cap at pleasure, to prevent him from destroying the prey. At first they throw small birds before him, and by degrees dispatch him after every bird flying in his sight, and not only after birds, but



after hares and gazelles. They carry him on the hand, securing one foot with a string, and letting him fly where these animals are found; he generally kills them, without lacerating them. The value of such a trained bird is about fifty Spanish piastres. Rats, hares, antelopes, foxes and wolves, are very common; and the ordinary domestic animals are the camel, the sheep, the goat, the ass, the horse, the cow, and the dog. The Bedúins here mix pounded date and honey with their butter, and lead a primitive life. The plants are but few, and are cited according to their Arabic names.

The next chapter, which relates to the remains of the former occupants of these districts, is very interesting. Granite and marble pillars, walls and tumuli, attest the immense population which once filled the immense tract from Alexandria to Murabut. The remains of the celebrated Baths of Cleopatra give but a faint idea of their ancient splendour; a far better idea of the magnificence of these ancient structures may be formed from the catacombs, which extend in all directions for nearly half a mile, near to which may be found other sepulchres hewn in the limestone. At Murabut there are vestiges of a powerful city near the sea, which extend to a very considerable distance under water. Other ruins were visible in this vicinity; among which those of the city Abusir are the most remarkable. Ancient characters, of which a specimen is given, were observed on one of its walls. Formerly a temple of Osiris stood here, from whom the name BUSIR or ABUSIR appears to be derived. The author is inclined to assign three dates to the ruins between Abusir and Agaba:—the first he attributes to the times of the Ptolemies or Romans, the second to the Saracens, and the third to the more modern Arabs, which tripartite classification he substantiates from the internal evidences.

He has subjoined plans of several of these ruins, on the walls of some of which he discovered Hebrew and Greek inscriptions of modern date; on the plains tombs of many saints were seen, but more particularly on the eminences. On the stones of a monument near *Sterrir* he noticed strange characters, which appear to us to have some affinity to the cabalistical alphabets of the Arabs, of which Hammeiz has given specimens. But the characters seem mostly to have been of Egyptian origin, and we clearly retrace the admixture of two Arabic and one Hebrew letter; probably they were some species of *ἐγχώρια γράμματα*. There is one continued succession of antiquities from Alexandria and Damanhur to Agaba, scarcely hitherto explored; and the remains of cities and villages are so numerous, that many important discoveries might be elicited from a careful examination of them. Although Dr. Scholz does not appear to have been

careless in his researches, he seems not to have been sufficiently versed in the ancient history and local traditions of these parts, to apply their aid to the elucidation of these monumental phenomena. The records of the Arabs, and the legends of the roving tribes, could not have been totally destitute of information; for instance, would not the retentive memory and highly-wrought mind of the Beduin, from long habits preserving the history and fables of his race, have furnished some data concerning the small Arabian city lying in desolation at *Wadi-Tanum*? would not some account also of the various harbours, which he has mentioned, have survived for a considerable period after their ruin?

At three hours distance from Agaba, remains of houses buried in the sands were noticed, which he conceives to correspond with the ancient Parætonium. He is of opinion, that

“before the period commemorated in history, the Libyans may have inhabited these fertile districts near the sea, and that they possessed the most intimate connexion with the inhabitants of the Oasis of Jupiter Ammon, or that those people may have inhabited it in part, whose descendants, INACHUS, PHORONEUS, CECROPS, and DANAUS, made the Greeks acquainted with Jupiter Ammon, whom we find in great honour among them. . . . Perhaps, also, near the sea and on the main road above Parætonium in the Pentapolis, in the latter times of the Persians and of the Ptolemies, vast nations may have resided, into which idea some of the ruins already described lead us. Probably, they were the Bashmuriens, who from their wild predatory spirit extended themselves from hence to the Delta. The tradition current among the Copts on this subject is favourable to this hypothesis.”

The succeeding chapter describes the present inhabitants of this territory. They are Beduins, who

“dwell in camps, (the situation of which they change from time to time,) under dark tents composed of hair-mats, to the number of two to three hundred families together. Each family has, according to the extent of its power, one or more tents, which are very spacious, though low, and fixed in several rows. The women scarcely ever dwell alone, but all the day form a circle for themselves, without intruding into that of the men. The head of each encampment (حېش) is a Sheikh, but these are rather co-ordinate than subordinate to those of the horde, to which they belong. The most powerful tribes of this region are the Waled' Ali, (ولد علي) the Jimiyat, (جيمية) and the Gharbi (غربي). Formerly, they were independent,” &c.

We cannot here enter into the copious detail, which he has given, of their power and condition, of the peculiar customs of their men and women, of their mode of traffic, and of the nature of their excursions. Their ordinary food is

“peas, beans, or barley-meal mixed and boiled with bits of barley-bread, and bread in the form of cakes, baked with onions under a charcoal fire. Butter is found in each department of housekeeping:—their children only drink milk, and eat meat but seldom. They are very fond of dates, which they purchase very cheaply in Siwa, and use them either as dried food, or mixed with meal and bread. They eat every thing out of wooden plates with their hands, sitting on the ground. They keep their stock of water in leathern vessels, their food and other property in worsted or leathern bags, or tubs platted from date leaves. . . . They never employ themselves in fishing, and seldom in hunting, although their country abounds with bares, antelopes, partridges, and ubaras. They more frequently take the antelopes alive, at the time when they are sleeping, and being but poor marksmen, they find it more convenient to train a species of hawk for fowling.”

European medicine was in great request among them, as in most other parts of the East.—Cautery at the back of the neck is one of their most usual remedies for illness. Their religion abounds with the most abject superstition; talismans and astrological researches, magical formularies and various omens, are common to all these tribes. The picture, which Scholz has drawn of the manners of this erratic people, is one of the best which we have seen, not even excepting that of Burckhardt: their mode of intercourse and barter with foreigners and each other, the peculiarity of their dispositions, their hospitality, and their fraudulent propensities, are delineated with the vivid pencil of an accomplished master. He has added, remarks on the different pronunciation which these Bedúins give to certain letters, and adduces many words and phrases in common use among them. He has, also, described the strange contortions and gestures, with which they accompany their songs, which very much resemble the Cossac dance; in these, he has distinguished a sort of theatrical or pantomimic acting, and retraced the ancient Chorus in the general union of voices at stated intervals.

From hence, he directs his attention to the country between Agaba and Siwa. After the traveller has ascended the heights of Agaba, a vast plain abounding in plants opens upon his view, the extremity of which is no where visible to the eye. It is inhabited to the west, but totally desert to the south. In this vicinity he discovered the ancient road, which led from Parætonium to Siwa, of the identity of which he imagines himself to have acquired ample proofs. The country abounded in antiquities, and presented ample scope to the geologist. The picture of the country, which he has sketched, is of a high character, and as a naturalist, he has displayed the most indefatigable perseverance.

“The ruins of the Temple of Jupiter Ammon (now called *Haima*



*Baida*) are the most important and the most celebrated. . . . Of the three parts, of which this temple, according to Strabo, consisted, we now only distinguish two, in the space which the fragments occupy. The under-parts of the third division are probably under the houses in the neighbourhood. We were informed of the remains of seven towns, and particularly of one heathen and Christian city. The catacombs in mount *El Mesagaret*, which the inhabitants refer to the highest antiquity, and in which, much that is interesting may be discovered by accurate investigation,—those farther off in Mount *Rakiyeh*, and others, as well as the ruins of *Busruf*—*Korasha*—*Obeiyah*, and *Laxaw*, on the eastern part of the Oasis, attest the fact. These remains, at the same time, inform us, who the earlier inhabitants were. The architecture, the devices and hieroglyphics on the temple denote the highest antiquity, and their descent from the Egyptians, who, in their ordinary works of art, surpass others as to accuracy of form.”

The modern inhabitants of Siwa dwell in four wretched villages, built in the Arabian style; they carry on a vast traffic in dates, and have such a quantity of fruits, that they annually load 500 camels with them. This traffic, however, consists in barter: for their dates, olives, beasts, and baskets made of twisted palm-leaves, the Arabs of Alexandria and Cairo, or the Beduins, bring corn, tobacco, manufactured wares, linen, coffee, &c. Their manners and language are considerably influenced by the negroes from the interior of Africa, natives of Fez, and Mograbis, who are resident among them. They live simply, and in their dress differ but little from the Egyptians. The men mostly content themselves with a shirt (بركان), the women with a shift, and a piece of blue cloth hanging down over the back. Their dialect differs from the Arabic, although they understand and speak that language: their grammar, syntax, and characters are Arabic, yet the dialect is the *Shilahh*, which is spoken by many tribes in the north of Africa, and is worthy of investigation, as containing many words of the old Punic, and as having probably been derived from it.

Being restricted by our limits, we must pass over many chapters equally interesting and novel, contenting ourselves with the following extract from them, illustrative of the Greek historians.

“The above mentioned petrifications, which Strabo, (pp. 49, 50, ed. Casaub.) records, we again find in the whole of this region, besides which, we discover behind *Libbuk* many pieces of petrified palmtrees, dark and of great solidity, which are frequently used to show the way, are often immense, and have but little changed their original form. Fungus, also, limestone containing shells, sand, and clay, are the ingredients of the whole territory, which are observed in a mixed state, and thrown one under the other by tempests, although, often separated in whole masses. They frequently stand alone in the shape of a pyramid, and then, the



different ingredients may be very accurately distinguished, particularly the parts of iron, which alternating in dark, yellow, brown, red, or party-coloured streaks, afford an interesting survey, yet are so brittle, that we cannot sufficiently wonder at their long state of preservation. The lake extends as far as this place, and probably to the neighbourhood of *Terraneh*. It was inhabited by marine animals of different sorts, and varied in places in depth and breadth. A hurricane or some other convulsion of nature burst through the sandy shore, the greatest part of the sea-water flowed through the low plains, which were towards the sea, the rest flowed in a body into the deep places, where it wonderfully fertilized the soil, and created those beautiful vales, which we call oases, or where palmtrees and many other shrubs grow together, without the careful hand of man. At present, it would be difficult to determine, where the water made its irruption. I would conjecture two spots, where I particularly remarked a gradual depression towards the sea. The first is to the north of Siwa :—the second, in the first instance, to the north-east of *Kara*, whence, it proceeds in an easterly direction, and at last in a northerly. Between *Libbuk* and *Terraneh*, no point seems adapted to the irruption. To this conjecture of a former lake here may the tradition in Herodotus be referred : the lake *Mæris* had a subterranean efflux into the Libyan Syrtis, in a westerly direction. He cannot here speak of the former flowing of the Nile, which was caused by Menes to take the direction of the Delta. This probably was not extended so far to the west, and is, like the other branches of the Nile in the Delta, choked and entirely lost by the clouds of sand carried there by the violent west winds. This last assumption would not even elucidate one of the preceding phenomena. Our assumption, on the contrary, explains every circumstance in this region. Springs of sweet water, as at Siwa, *Kara*, *Kheishe*, &c. were frequently remarked near the sea and salt-lakes. Now, if the vegetation was first occasioned by human labour, or which is more probable, if the seeds of it floated to this place from Egypt, the luxuriance of growth can only be explained by this hypothesis.

We, now, passing by his intermediate adventures, return to him on his arrival at Cairo. Its population is composed of men of many nations, Arabs, Turks, Mamelukes, Berbers, Negroes, Jews, Copts, Armenians, Franks, Bedúins, and travellers from the interior of Africa and Asia. The number of Franks amounts nearly to 1,500, they are mostly Italian merchants and manufacturers, and dwell in the quarter *Jamiá*. There are two Roman Catholic convents here, each having a small church. An ample description of the other religious endowments of the Franks is given. The Copts have decreased under the heavy oppression of the different lords of the land : their whole number of churches is about 100, of which twenty-three, furnished with six convents, are in Cairo ; but in ancient Cairo, they constitute the chief population, and have five convents. Among them modern MSS.

only, for the use of the church, are found, which, without an Arabic translation at the side, they do not understand. The monks in Upper Egypt alone now well understand the Coptic. The title of their patriarch is *صاحب كرسي مارب مرقص الانجيلي*

Signor Drouetti is mentioned as likely to afford valuable services to Coptic literature, because he is in possession of eight MSS. of the Bible, in the Saitical dialect, and of the *σοφία Σολομώντος*, in the Memphitic, which, however, are partly decayed.

Our author gives a wretched account of the Jews in Africa, and observes, that those in Abyssinia lead a nomadic life, &c. and acknowledge only the Pentateuch, as their book of religion. He has recorded the tradition of the three great Jewish caravans, which travelled to Abyssinia, in the reign of Solomon, the first with a natural son of Solomon by the Queen of Sheba, &c. His observations on the Abyssinian dialects and the catalogue of words which he has subjoined, might, if they had been more extended, reflect light on the ancient language of this singular district, and enable us to calculate the ratio of its admixture with the Arabic.

There are several libraries and literary institutions at Cairo, abounding with rare MSS.

“The *Dare’l hakmet* (دار الحكمة), now called *Jamia-e’lázhar* (جامع الأزهر) with its invaluable library, which, according to Macrizi, was instituted in the second *Yaumadi*, A’ 395, is one of the greatest literary establishments in the Ottoman dominions. It is an immense building, with many colonnades, in which pupils, to the number of two thousand, sitting in more than 150 different classes, receive instruction in reading, writing, grammar, the Koràn, and jurisprudence.

To Christians, not only the library, but the school, is inaccessible. . . . . Should a rich man die without heirs, and bequeath any thing in his will to a *Jamia*, for repairs, light, carpets, and supply of other requisites, he always leaves the money to a person in high office, or a Sheikh or Imàm, or a rich merchant, who places it in security, by purchasing with it the adjoining property, houses, lands, &c.”

We must again pass over a considerable tract, and join Dr. Scholz at *Mataria*, where he saw the celebrated sycamore, under which the Holy Family is said to have rested; in the neighbourhood of which, he discovered the site of Heliopolis, an obelisk, and many sarcophagi. In one of the subsequent chapters, are many valuable remarks relative to the geology and the natural history of Palestine, and of a part of Syria, which have rarely been exceeded in luminous perspicuity, and seldom equalled by any

traveller in these regions. He observed many caves in Carmel, "which formerly had been the habitation of hermits," although we are more inclined to refer them to the sepulchral mansions of the former occupants of the country.

"The largest of them, called the School of Elijah, is much venerated both by Mohammedans and Jews. The cave is guarded by an Imâm: it is eighteen paces long and ten wide. All round, excepting on the left side, is a recess for the Divân, in the midst of which, small grottos, five more paces long and five broad, are regularly hewn in the rock. At the back part of the greater division are lamps and rags, which may have been military standards, and are very devoutly treated by the Mohammedans making a pilgrimage to this place. During my stay, many came here, who first prayed at the entrance, then in the middle, and lastly, near the lamps, terminating their devotions by kissing the insignia. The Mohammedans and Jews account it the School of Elijah;—that, in the monastery above they account the School of Elishah."

He has, also, transcribed a long Greek inscription, which he found near this place: but we conceive him in error as to the rags being military insignia. They are commonly suspended, as votive offerings, on or near the tombs of saints, wherever the religion of Mohammed has an influence: the Persians suspend them on trees, and they are, doubtless, remains of the votive offerings of the ancients.

" Me tabulâ sacer  
Votivâ paries indicat uvida  
Suspendisse potenti  
Vestimenta maris Deo."

We regret being obliged to pass over his topographical list, his variety of Hebrew and Greek inscriptions, and the rich materials with which he has presented us, for the developement of the ancient and modern history of these countries. The ecclesiastical antiquities of Palestine, and the account of the Christian sects, are treated in considerable detail, and with much careful examination. He has largely discussed the state and manners of the inhabitants of Palestine, and appears to have traversed an extraordinary number of its cities and villages, noticing the political revolutions, which have caused the existing divisions of its government.

"Gaza lies in a somewhat uneven, but very fruitful land, at a quarter of an hour from the sea. . . . Olives, figs, oranges, sweet citrons, palm-trees, Indian figs, grow all around in vast abundance, and the most luxuriant vegetation, corn, *Malwa*, (the daily food of the inhabitants of Palestine in spring,) &c. &c., adorn this soil. . . . The inhabitants of Gaza are only Mohammedans, and schismatical Christians of the Greek church, 300 in number. The former, 5,700 in number, have above

30 mosques ; ... the Greeks have only one church. ... Some years since, there were Jews of the sect of the Talmudists : they were formerly very numerous and affluent. Six years ago, the last Jewish family sold their house and the stones of the synagogue (which spot the *Mutsallem* changed into a garden), and removed, as the rest had done before them, back to *Halil*. The Samaritans had totally abandoned it fifty years before, and returned to Nabolus. The Franks had quitted it a much longer time, and the Armenians and Copts have not found here a fixed residence."

Dr. Scholz visited at Tiberias the synagogues of the German and Portuguese Jews, and discovered, on examining their libraries, with the exception of some MSS. of the fifteenth century, merely Hebrew and rabbinical works, printed in Italy, Germany, Amsterdam, Lisbon, and Constantinople. He found some few Druses resident at *Beirut*, who appear to be settled there for purposes of commerce. To all these cities, there is a *Mutsallem* or governor, who is appointed and generally annually exchanged by the Pacha of Acre, as well as a chief of the military. The heads of the religious sects are appointed to receive the *miri* or taxes. Every city having walls and gates (which all have, but Gaza and Nazareth) is closed in the evening, and the keys are brought to the governor, without whose permission the gates cannot be opened. Each, also, has a *Kad'hi*, who is sent from Constantinople, to whom the administration of justice in the city and district belongs.

He then describes the immense extent to which the jurisdiction of these *Mutsallems* reaches, and observes, that Christians and Jews mostly live in the cities. Over the doors in Nabolus, Jerusalem, and other cities, Arabic sentences from the Koran are commonly found, written in the Miskh character in red, denoting that the owners are *Hajjis*. Jerusalem contains about 18,000 inhabitants,—2,150 Christians, (800 Catholics, 1,100 of the Greek Church, 200 Armenians, and 50 Copts and Syrians,)—5,000 Mohammedans, and 10,000 Jews. It is situated on an uneven eminence, is surrounded with a wall, and has six gates. He is very particular respecting the Christian communities, both here and in Syria, and gives more information of the different sects, than any of his recent predecessors. He enters largely also into the difference between the colloquial and written Arabic, and discusses its dialectical variations in Egypt, Syria, and Jerusalem. The largest library in Syria he affirms to be at Acre.

We must bear in mind, that during these extensive travels, (of which we have given but a very brief and imperfect analysis,) the writer devoted his attention to biblical MSS., wherever he could discover them, and that he collated them, for



the purpose of rectifying the text of the New Testament. Hence, as this work is now in the press, to which 600 MSS. unknown to Griesbach have lent their aid, it is right that the scene of his labours should be made known to the theologian, before the work itself shall pass in review before us. As a book of travels, we cannot speak too highly of it; as a preparation to a series of biblical criticisms, we are still further bound to appreciate it, not only as making known to us one branch of the sources from whence his readings are extracted, but as certifying us, likewise, of the state of Christianity in those regions through which he passed. The other branch is his Biblical Tour in Europe, which we shall examine in a future number.

---

- ART. VI.—1. *A Friendly Address to the Episcopalians of Scotland, on Baptismal Regeneration; showing that it is the doctrine of Scripture, of the earliest and purest Christian Antiquity, and of the reformed Episcopal Church, as expressed in its Liturgy.* By the Right Reverend Alexander Jolly, one of the Bishops in Scotland. London: Rivington. 1826. 8vo. 56 pp. 1s. 6d.
2. *A Charge, delivered on the 14th of June, 1826, to the Clergy of the Episcopal Communion of Ross and Argyle.* By the Right Reverend David Low, LL.D. their Bishop. Bell and Bradfute, Edinburgh; and Rivington, London. 8vo. 1s. 6d.
3. *The Office of an Evangelist and Physician of the Soul: a Sermon, preached in the Episcopal Chapel at Stirling on Wednesday, October the 18th, 1826, being the Festival of St. Luke, at the Ordination of the Reverend Samuel Heed.* By the Reverend B. Bailey, M.A. Domestic Chaplain to the Right Honourable Lord Torphichen, and Minister of the Episcopal Chapel at Arbroath. Bell and Bradfute, Edinburgh; C. & J. Rivington, London; and J. Chalmers, Dundee. 8vo. pp. 36.

IN the Prospectus to this Review, we undertook to give an occasional report of the state and progress of the Episcopal Church of Scotland; but the clergy of that church have furnished us with very few opportunities of fulfilling our engagement. At this we are the more surprised inasmuch as we know some of those clergy to be at once learned, pious, and zealous for the truth. Lately indeed we had occasion to take a very brief notice of a controversy concerning *baptismal regeneration*, which originated in Edinburgh from the conduct of a clergyman of the Church of England, who seems to have intruded himself into the Scotch

Episcopal Church without being called by any authority whatever, either ecclesiastical or civil. The subject discussed in the first of the three tracts, of which we have placed the titles at the top of this article, is likewise *baptismal regeneration*; but its learned and pious author enters into no *personal* controversy with any individual. He states the doctrine as it is taught in Scripture; in the writings of the earliest fathers of the primitive church, and in the liturgy of the Church of England: and his view of it cannot be better expressed than in a passage which he quotes from a former Scotch Bishop, who appears to have been as conversant with the writings of the primitive fathers as Bishop Jolly is himself.

The Bishop, in a letter to a friend who had talked and written of a *process of regeneration*, says,—

“ Your expression of a *process of regeneration*, which I do not remember to have met with, either in the Scriptures or in the writings of any of the primitive fathers, I suppose to be a mistake, for so you must allow me to call it; and indeed such a mistake it is as will draw many other consequential ones along with it, and give a very different turn to the doctrine of the Christian Œconomy. I think both the Scriptures and the primitive fathers constantly ascribe our regeneration to baptism, (including under it also what we now call confirmation,) as being that by which the spirit, the principle of this new life, is first infused into us. It is true that, although we are said to be τέλειοι (perfect) immediately upon our baptism, wherein we receive that spirit which constituteth the perfect man; yet there is a gradual progress and growth in the spiritual life answerable to that in the natural; but it is as improper, in my opinion, to call the one a process of regeneration, as it would be to call the other a process of generation, since we are as completely regenerated in baptism of the incorruptible seed of the word of God, as we are begotten at first of the corruptible seed of our earthly parents.”

This doctrine is in perfect harmony with that of the Bishop of Gloucester, the Church of England, and the Holy Scriptures.

Bishop Low's *Charge* is composed in a style very different from Bishop Jolly's *Friendly Address*, and is calculated to do more harm than good to the cause which he advocates. Of the past conduct of the English Church he speaks indeed with gratitude; but he seems to think—and there never was a more unfounded suspicion—that at present the Church of Scotland is ill treated by her southern sister.

After referring to a former Charge, of which he says the subject naturally led him to tread over ashes not yet extinguished; and observing that the subject of this Charge is not perhaps much less debatable, he enters on the subject thus:—

“ Whether we regard the past or the present time, the Church of

England is to us an object of primary consideration and interest. In looking at the past, we must feel that we owe to her a debt of deep gratitude for much friendly aid, and for many essential services. Twice, in 1610, namely, and in 1661, we received from thence the episcopal succession; and some of her most distinguished dignitaries have received in return their orders from us. TILLOTSON and others were ordained by a Scotch bishop, when our Church was more depressed than she is now, and when the Church of England herself was as much humbled as her worst enemies could well wish.\*

“In the suffering state to which we were reduced at the Revolution, in 1688, we received much affectionate sympathy and support. This sympathy for our severe and unmerited sufferings continued through the reign of Queen Anne; and when the legal persecution against us was carried to its utmost height by the Acts of 1746 and 1748, twenty-four bishops withdrew (from the House of Peers) with one consent, regarding these Acts, and particularly the latter, as measures equally unnecessary and unwise. Some of them, indeed, SECKER, SHERLOCK, and MADDOX, declared, without hesitation, during the progress of the bill, that they thought it much worse than unwise, and that it was in fact nothing less than the persecution and proscription of the very religion which was established in England, in Ireland, and in the colonies.

“After that unfortunate period our Church was involved in a cloud of deep obscurity, which was first dissipated by the consecration of Dr. Seabury, in 1784. This event brought us again into a certain degree of notice in England, and somewhat revived the interest and renewed in our behalf the sympathy of *real* churchmen in that part of the kingdom.

“The repeal of the penal laws, in 1792, restored to us the rights of simple toleration, clogged, however, with a restriction in regard to our orders, which is neither generous nor just. In acknowledging the gratitude which we owe to the Church of England, I maintain that we have fully merited all that we have received, by the uniform, the consistent, and the conscientious discharge of our duty, particularly in that we have ever steadily avoided all sectarian courses and connections, by which, had we been so deluded, or so depraved, we might certainly have done very serious injury to the Church of England, both at home and abroad. No one can calculate the effects which the power connected with a *real* episcopacy might have produced, or may yet produce in the hands of the Methodists, or even of the high evangelical party in the Church.”

Bishop Low is not probably aware that by some of the Wesleyan Methodists application was actually made to the late Primate of the Scotch Episcopal Church for episcopal consecration to one of their preachers, soon after Dr. Seabury had been consecrated. The late Dr. Berkeley of Canterbury was in possession of the letter in which the application was made to Bishop Skinner, together with that prelate's refusal to comply with the request. We readily believe Bishop Low, therefore, when he

\* See Tonn's Deans of Canterbury, and EVELYN's Memoirs.



says that there never has been, nor is at present the slightest danger of the Scotch bishops conferring the advantage of a real episcopacy either on the Methodists or on any other English sectarists. And we rejoice in the belief, not so much for the sake of the English as of the Scotch church: to the former such a step might prove inconvenient and even injurious; to the latter it would be an overwhelming disgrace.

Bishop Low complains that, in consequence of the restriction upon Scottish orders in the Act of 1792, several clergymen were daily intruding themselves into a church, the authority of whose bishops they despise, and not only despise themselves, but by means of those restrictive acts of the legislature, are able to persuade well-meaning though ill-informed men, that it is by the English Church really considered as despicable.

“ For those clergymen of English and Irish ordination (not driven hither by some imperious or mysterious necessity, for which we cannot account,) who have come among us regularly, and not from birth or connection in our country, or by fair election and regular testimonials have obtained charges in our Church, I entertain as sincere a respect and regard as I do for those clergy who from their infancy have been trained amongst ourselves, and were specially ordained for the duties of our ministry. The former will not, therefore, for a moment imagine that any animadversion that I may make can affect them any more than I can mean it to affect myself, or any other of the indigenous ministers of whom our ecclesiastical body is composed. On the contrary, I feel that to some of them we are under the greatest obligations, and they are men on whom I could rely with perfect confidence in any emergency or difficulty affecting the honour and the interest of the humble communion, of which, if need were, they would be the stay and the support in future, as they are, being connected with another and a more flourishing Church, the ornaments at present.

“ Men, however, who intrude amongst us, without putting it in our power to ascertain how they conducted themselves in their former residence, and who take advantage of any kindness shown them to insinuate themselves, and eventually to exercise strong popular influence, we have but too much reason to suspect, notwithstanding their high pretensions to superior sanctity. Of this we have repeatedly had painful experience since I became a minister of this Church; and one instance is recent, of a man thus insinuating himself into a charge in Edinburgh, who affected and acquired the character of a very holy and spiritual person, but who at length was obliged to depart in haste, to avoid a public criminal prosecution, and its ignominious consequences. Of the same class of intruders are to be found some who, with words and writings smoother than oil, and under the pretence of an extraordinary purity of doctrine, can, without remorse, expose and calumniate their brethren—ridicule every law of order, of peace, and of charity—and, with an effrontery without a parallel, claim to be themselves the only *Gospel* ministers in a



church, whose doctrine they disown, and whose discipline they disobey. These men, their principle and their practices, I earnestly warn every brother, as well lay as cleric, *plusquam incendium fugere.*"

These, it must be acknowledged, are serious evils; and we are confident that the rulers of the Church of England would gladly co-operate in removing them. But the proper remedy is still to be discovered. The reason, we believe, which Archbishop Moore assigned for introducing the restraining clause into all the acts in which it occurs, was his dread of half-educated clergymen from Scotland and America pouring into England, and obtaining curacies at least, if not livings, in the Church. This dread was not unnatural; and it was certainly his Grace's duty to prevent such inundations of half-educated men into the Church of England; but this, we apprehend, might have been done by other means than an absolute prohibition of Scotch orders—a prohibition which naturally wounds the feelings, lowers the reputation, and emboldens the adversaries of a sister whom we ought to cherish with especial kindness, but who is at present worse used than strangers to our blood and faith. A priest or deacon of the Romish or Greek Church, on renouncing his errors before the proper authority, taking the necessary oaths, and making the necessary subscriptions, is admissible to execute the functions of his order in any church in England; but such a privilege is peremptorily denied to every one who has received orders from the Churches of America and Scotland. This strange anomaly affords reasonable ground for complaint, and, without pretending to say that the means of removing it are obvious, we are sanguine enough to hope that some scheme may be devised, which will remove the unjust stigma now attached to the Church in Scotland, without exposing our English bishops to the unpleasant duty of re-examining persons who are already in orders. But the arrangement of such a measure is a delicate and difficult task, and will be most effectually checked by any further manifestation of that unhappy spirit and temper, which are too visible in the Charge of Bishop Low.

The tract which stands last at the head of this Article, is a sermon preached by a clergyman, who, if he be, as we imagine he is, of English ordination, is surely one of those for whom Bishop Low professes as sincere a regard and respect, as for those who from their infancy had been trained in the Scotch Episcopal Church. The subject of the discourse is distinctly stated in the title; and Mr. Bailey, in treating it, displays considerable ingenuity and address, in adapting what he says as well to the *festival* as to the *occasion* on which he was preaching.

It is not easy to select from a single sermon, where the whole is connected together by that which the father of criticism calls a

beginning; a middle, and an end, any short passage which will give the reader a complete view of the preacher's doctrine. Mr. Bailey, after explaining the meaning of the word *evangelist*, showing that it is not the official title of any *permanent* order of ministers in the Church, but given to *all* orders who, being employed to preach the Gospel to the Heathen, were so inspired as to be able to preach the truth, and nothing but the truth, as it is in Jesus; and observing, that the original and inspired Evangelists having left so perfect a rule of faith behind them, that no supernatural inspiration is now required, says,

"By labour and by learning, by prayer and watchfulness, with such assistance as every Christian, and certainly every clergyman, may expect, and will unquestionably derive, if he be in earnest, from the ordinary operations of Grace, must we *do the work of evangelists, and fulfil our ministry*. These are the weapons of our warfare; and these, if sedulously exerted, are amply sufficient for our victory. With these we must *fight the good fight*; and that we may *finish our career* with success, we must *keep the faith*.

"There is, however, another very essential, nay indispensable, duty of an evangelist; besides *keeping the faith* and preaching *sound doctrine*, he must, if possible, keep the *unity* of the faith. We read in the Acts of the Apostles, that the primitive Christian converts, after they had gladly received the word and been baptised, continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and *fellowship*—*κοινωνία*—and in breaking of bread, and in prayers, with their fellow-Christians. Much, indeed, is talked, in this age, of *evangelical doctrine*; but *evangelical fellowship*—the communion in *breaking of bread* in the Lord's Supper, and in prayers—is entirely lost sight of, as though these subjects of *fellowship* had never been mentioned in the sacred oracles of revealed religion. But this Christian fellowship is inculcated in the strongest terms by the first preachers of the Gospel, as well as shown in the example of the primitive Christians.

"To exhort every disciple of Christ, who is under his ministry, to imitate, by his own example, as well as by his exhortations, all Christians to this blessed *fellowship*—in spirit, in the sacraments, and in the public worship of God—is a very chief and important work of an evangelist; and he who raises or supports a schism—whether a clergyman or a lay person, but more especially a clergyman—is guilty of a very great and dangerous sin."

Mr. Bailey enforces this doctrine in very strong terms in a note, which we are much inclined to insert here; but the Article has already swelled beyond the limits within which we hoped to compress it. We must, therefore, conclude with observing, that there is little danger indeed of the Church of England and Ireland being inundated by half-educated clergymen from a church, in which the Doctors Jolly and Low are bishops, and Mr. Bailey a presbyter.

ART. VI.—*The History of the Reign of Henry the Eighth: comprising the Political History of the Commencement of the English Reformation.* By Sharon Turner, F.S.A. & R.A.S.L. Second Edition. London. Longman & Co. 1827. 2 vols. 8vo. 26s.

IN the present state of the controversy between the Churches of England and Rome, it was not probable that the ground of History, however much previously beaten, should escape fresh occupation; not only by such as entered into the dispute in the guise of avowed Polemics, but by others also whom the din of arms might, at first, attract as spectators, rather than as partakers of the contest. Accordingly, a very brief period of time has produced no less than three new Histories of the Reformation; each widely distinguished from its fellows by the separate objects, talents and prepossessions of its writer; and two of them, at least, demanding attention on account of certain novelties which they have ventured to introduce. Mr. Soames has been content with the humble, but by no means unuseful, task of compilation, abridgment, and rearrangement: but Dr. Lingard and Mr. Turner are of more ambitious temperament. The first of these gentlemen has opened a private Still, in which, by a variety of adulterating processes, he has mixed together old liquors till they appear new; and dashed and flavoured them by that which the dealers technically name *surplus extractive matter*, till they have acquired an aroma fit for the gunpowder palates of his customers. The second has fairly and honestly imported neat commodities from the genuine vineyards; but, as we think, has occasionally failed in the subsequent labour of bottling and corking. Or, to adopt a loftier metaphor, Dr. Lingard is a knowing renovator of ancient sculpture for the modern market; who thoroughly understands, as it best suits his purpose, how to turn a “graceless Venus” to “a Virgin,” or to “christen Jove” by investing him with the “Keys of Peter:” while Mr. Turner, on the other hand, is an ardent virtuoso, who, in the simplicity of connoisseurship, now and then calls Pan, Apollo, and worships that for Hebe which the artist himself did not intend should be better than Hecate.

But the main object which Mr. Turner has contemplated in the composition of the volumes now before us, will be best learned by attention to his own statement of it. Having already brought down the History of England to the close of the reign of Henry VII., we are not surprised to hear that he began to feel his sight somewhat bewildered by the wide prospect which opened to him in that which, in common with Lord Bolingbroke, he considers



to be the *modern* history of our country. The fatigue to be encountered, if he pursued his path, alarmed him, and he paused for rest. The inquiries, however, of two friends, Messrs. Southey and Butler, (both leading controversialists, though in opposite interests, on the period which he was approaching,) on some points which he felt unable to answer to his own satisfaction, decided him once again to engage in researches which had been suspended, but not abandoned. He recommenced, therefore, with a determination of avoiding repetitions from former printed accounts, of declining direct entrance upon the disputes which his contemporaries were agitating, and of depending for his information upon a diligent inspection of all the MS. remains to which access could be obtained. These consisted, principally, of a very rich collection of despatches and correspondence preserved in the British Museum, which, he thinks, has been singularly disregarded by former writers. Among these documents are to be found Letters from Ambassadors and Agents, in all parts of Europe, to the King himself, to Wolsey, and to the Ministers who succeeded him; their several instructions, and other very important and voluminous State Papers.

It is impossible to peruse Mr. Turner's pages without a conviction that the most praiseworthy diligence and indefatigable labour has been exercised by him, in consulting, transcribing, and arranging these curious MSS.: and, doubtless, many particulars of minute History will be found illustrated, and many errors or perversions of other authors corrected, by the light thus gathered from sources hitherto unexplored. This is no trifling merit, but it is not *all* the merit to which that class of writers aspires among whom Mr. Turner has sought to enrol his name; and beyond this our praise cannot extend. We have seldom been more perplexed than in our attempts to determine the grounds upon which Mr. Turner, for the most part, builds the judgments which he passes on facts and characters. With his narrative we have but little quarrel; but in all which a present Scotch Professor or a future lecturer at the London University would call the *Philosophy of History*, that is, in plain speaking, in his reflections and deductions, he is involved, obscure, and, very often, contradictory. Moreover, all those qualities which must so much heighten and increase his value in social and private life, (and no man, we are convinced, possesses more of these,) his gentleness of spirit, his piety, his benevolence and his tenderness of heart, are perpetually oozing out through his pen, and meandering in sentimental and soporific paragraphs, in season and out of season, to the manifest detriment of that evenness and sobriety which Historical composition demands, more, perhaps, than any other. Lastly, his style is



so tinselled and embroidered with cumbrous metaphor, that we frequently have much ado to discover the threads of texture for which we are searching under the plaster of ornaments with which they are oppressed and overwhelmed.

After all, perhaps, Mr. Turner's leading fault is that of being too much enamoured of his hero; and of having created to himself a *beau ideal*, for the maintenance of which he is obliged to have perpetual recourse to distortion of reasoning. So that although unable to deny, and, for the most part, little seeking to palliate, in the very moment of relation, any of the enormities which the selfish and merciless Tyrant concerning whom he writes committed, he no sooner gets them once out of immediate sight, and leaves the sacrifice of a Minister or the murder of a Wife a page or two behind him, than we might imagine ourselves transported to the times of a Titus or a Trajan. For it is not by raising any "Historic Doubts" that he would persuade us that posterity has been deceived in its appreciation of Henry's character; it is rather by producing abstract arguments on his motives. If Mr. Turner had been actuated by a similar inclination to prove that Richard III. was immaculate, he would freely have granted the murder at Tewkesbury, the assassination of Henry VI., the butt of Malmsey, the poisoning of Edward IV., the smothering of the infant Princes, and such other reputed peccadillos as have been generally ascribed to the Crookbacked, and then would have proceeded, with the most imperturbable gravity, logically to demonstrate that these crimes were not the result either of ferocity or ambition.

That we have not mistaken the hypothesis which Mr. Turner undertakes to maintain respecting Henry, is clear from almost the very outset of his work.

"The present subject of the commencement of the Modern History of England, has suggested these reflections; because the reign of Henry the Eighth was the opening of one of those emerging periods of reviving splendor in the cultivation of the human mind: and because some of the ablest judges and most zealous promoters of this happy change expressly connect it with the example and conduct of the English sovereign."—vol. i. p. 5.

The early part of Henry's reign was such as might be expected from a Prince careless of the expenditure, though by no means so of the acquisition of money, fond of splendour, devoted to pleasure, ambitious, brave, and powerful. His Court was, perhaps, the most magnificent and attractive in Europe; and the youthful Monarch himself was not among its least brilliant ornaments. Exclusive of his personal accomplishments, which we may readily believe to have been of the highest order, he possessed

quickness of parts, and had turned this to advantage; for he had acquired the current Literature of his day, such as it was; and could dispute with sufficient subtilty on Dialectics and School Divinity. Thus much (and not more) may be predicated of his talents and attainments from the Works which he has left behind him; and these are the only true criterion by which he can now be estimated. The intellect of every reigning Prince is rated at an equal height by most contemporary writers, who are honoured with access to the royal person; and we might just as well believe that the Venetian Ambassador, Justiniani, spoke the truth of Henry's bodily powers, when he saluted him as "Apollo and Mars," as give literal credit to the shrewd and penetrating Erasmus, when he wrote that the young King's happy and versatile genius "prevailed in an incredible manner to whatever subject he addressed himself," and that "the soundness and acuteness of his mind would be surprising in the most learned Theologians."

Mr. Turner dwells with evident pleasure on the chivalrous pastimes of Henry's youth. They are related *con amore*, and with good taste.

"But the great enjoyment of Henry was from his personal prowess in the just and tournament. His first exhibition of it after his coronation, was made the next winter in Richmond Park. He had never ran a course publicly before; but, as some gentlemen were justing, two armed strangers, unknown to any one, joined the lists; and of these one broke so many spears against his opponents, as to attract great praise. His companion, who at first had been successful, at last received a wound from Lord Abergavenny's brother that was likely to be fatal. At this period, one person, looking at the admired knight, suddenly cried out, 'God save the king!' Every one was astonished; and Henry, discovering himself, gave great pleasure to the people from his triumph and his condescension.

"The temper of his mind will be best displayed by noticing his amusements. He tried his skill at the ring in the presence of the Spanish ambassadors. He went richly armed, with a plume of feathers waving from his head down to the saddle, and with trumpets sounding before him. Of twelve courses, he bore away the ring five times, and thrice touched it. Surpassing his competitors, he won the prize.

"On May day, with all his knights and gentlemen in white satin, and with his guard and yeomen in sarsnet, he went to fetch the green bows of the spring. Placing them in their caps, they took their bows and arrows, and went to the woods. He shot as strong and to as great a length as any of his guard.

"At Whitsuntide, with two companions, he challenged all comers to combat at the barriers, with targets, and casting off spears of eight feet long, and then to fight twelve strokes with two-handed swords. He was assailed by several valiant and strong persons, but displayed so much hardy prowess and great strength, that he obtained the chief applause.

"Removing to Windsor, he began a progress through the country. In this he exercised himself daily in shooting, singing, dancing, wrestling, and casting of the bar; he also indulged himself more intellectually in playing on recorders, on the flute and on virginals; in composing songs, making ballets, and in setting two masses. To these he added hunting, hawking, and shooting, besides occasional jousts and tourneys.

"His love of robust exercises appeared again in October, when he fought a stout and tall German with battle axes, and in the next month he challenged all comers with spears at tilt one day, and with swords at turney the next. He broke more spears than any, and in both the contests carried the prize."—vol. i. pp. 56—58.

These diversions, however, were not always unattended with danger, and old men shook their heads and said, no steel was so strong but it might be broken, and no horse so sure of foot but he might fall, and one moment might leave the nation without a Tudor King. These apprehensions, it seems, were more than once well nigh verified.

"The king once experienced the peril of these sports. Having a new armor of his own device, such as no armorer had before seen, he wished to essay it. His antagonist was the Duke of Suffolk. They took their stations at the opposite ends of the tilt. His spear was delivered to the king; but in his eagerness, he forgot to pull down and fasten the visor of his helmet: the signal was given, and he charged with his usual energy, unknowing that his face was bare. The duke, who had closed the frontal of his helmet, could not see at any distance, and as he knew Henry never made it child's play, and always wished a real and manly encounter, he prepared as usual to give a vigorous onset. It happened that he had determined to strike the king's head, and couched his lance so as to clash upon his face. As the steeds ran, the people saw the king's uncovered cheeks, and cried vociferously 'bold!' but neither of the tilters heard or heeded in his impetuous career; and the duke's spear, exactly aimed, as they came near, when no human force could check the collision, struck the king on the eye-brow, right under the defence of his head-piece. Nothing could have saved him, but that a part of the skull-cap, to which the visor is fastened, and which being always covered by that, was never made with any care, received the blow. It happened to be strong enough to resist the spear's blunted point. As Henry never shrunk from his vigorous seat, he stood the full collision, and the weapon shivered to pieces on his face. Every one thought him killed; and several ran upon the duke to avenge the mischief. But the king soon recovered from the unusual shock on a part so little guarded; and to show both his safety and good humor, called his armorer to put his helmet again together, and had the hardihood to run six more courses, amid the wonder and applause of his admiring subjects.

"Two years afterwards, the king's venturesome spirit put him in great danger of death in another of his favorite pastimes. He was fond of falconry: in following his hawk at Hitchin, he came to a wide ditch, and planted his pole in the middle, to spring over it; but as he took his



leap, the pole broke with his weight, and he fell into the water, where his face was detained by the adhesive clay at the bottom, into which it had sunk. If his footman had not jumped into the water in time to disengage and raise his head, he would have been soon drowned."—vol. i. pp. 66, 67.

The early and harmless pursuits of Nero have been recorded in like manner by *his* biographer also, who speaks of them very much as they deserve. *Hæc partim nullâ reprehensione, partim non mediocri laude digna, in unum contuli, ut secernerem a probris et sceleribus quibus de dehinc dicam.* (Suet. Nero, 19.) With Henry, as with the Roman Emperor, those pages which contain accounts of his youthful sports, are those alone in all his history which are not sullied by memorials of cruelty and guilt.

Respecting Wolsey, it would not now be easy to advance any authentic matter which has escaped the close personal observation of Cavendish, or the diligence of Fiddes. Mr. Turner has collected faithfully the most remarkable particulars of the habits and manners of this extraordinary man; but has failed, as we think, to estimate him at the high standard which is deserved by the great powers of his genius, his magnificent views, and his long and successful career as a Statesman. During a period fertile in men of superior intellect, Wolsey stood pre-eminent, and was arbiter of the destinies of Europe. His friendship and influence were the chief objects which Monarchs, rarely equalled, never surpassed, in policy, activity, and power, solicited and gloried to obtain. We never rise from the perusal of *any* History of England without considering this much-abused Cardinal, in the early part of his life, as the greatest Minister whom our country has produced; and assuredly we never turn to Cavendish's simple and most touching Memoir, without a conviction that the meek and patient endurance of contumelies, wrongs, and persecution, which the discarded favourite exhibited, in his closing scenes, fully atoned for the Pride (that never-ending theme of obloquy) with which he is justly chargeable during his prosperity. Towards Henry he was blameless; and were it not that later deeds of atrocity have made the King's ingratitude a grain in the scale of his crimes, this of itself would have been sufficient to stamp his memory with infamy. With all Wolsey's faults (and we are far from denying that there is a sufficient harvest of them to gratify the uttermost malice of his enemies) be it remembered that, during his long administration, the government of Henry was comparatively mild, and that this Minister stood as the sole floodgate which stemmed the fury of the Tyrant's wrath. But no sooner had the King tasted blood, after the dismissal of his faithful servant, than



he washed his hands and deeply dyed his garments in the richest streams which flowed in the veins of his subjects.

It is to such passages as that which we are about to cite below, in summary of Wolsey's character, (and such are not sparingly interspersed throughout Mr. Turner's work,) that one of our prefatory remarks is addressed.

"In contemplating such an extravagant specimen of human arrogance and vanity as Wolsey in his mature age chose to become, it is delightful and consoling to the mind to remember that the most stupendous Being in nature is peculiarly distinguished by the absence of all pride, and by the perpetual practice of that amenity in himself which he has enjoined to his creatures. There is nothing ostentatious or supercilious about him. He expands a mighty creation before our eyes in quiet sublimity, but leaves the operation of its silent grandeur to its own impressions on our unprejudiced sensibility, without projecting himself in personal pomp or dramatic spectacle before us, challenging and compelling an extorted applause. His natural and ordinary appeals to our reason and our feelings are tranquil, intellectual, and unassuming. We must seek him, to find him. We must trace the wondrous hand which is everywhere discernible, though always invisible. In his revelations, he calls not for our adulation or our applause. His request, as to himself, is for our love; and as to our own happiness, for our obedience to his wise and kind legislation, in order to ensure and perpetuate the felicity we covet. Praise is the natural language of our gratitude and adoration: the presented homage of our judgment. For who can candidly survey the magnificence of nature, the benignity of its provisions, and the skill of its multiform construction, and withhold the hallelujah, the benediction, and the sympathy? The noblest spirits of the most enlightened ages have felt it impossible not to breathe the aspirations of their delighted wisdom, and affectionate veneration; but yet the Sovereign of the Universe never claims by personal ostentation what is indeed of no value, if not the heartfelt and spontaneous tribute. Free from all imposing, conceited, and fastidious pride, he displays as his settled character the most condescending kindness; for without this divine quality, would he have deigned to plan and organize animals and insects, whom even we despise, and watch over the robin and the worm as graciously as over man? Nothing is too insignificant for his care, nor too minute for his creation; and nothing, however lowly, is forgotten by his goodness. What a contrast to man! who looks down with contempt on what is inferior, and is so often uneasy till his self-love is gratified by the awe and wonder, the commendations and flattery, which he can extort by domineering arrogance and exerted tyranny; or by the tawdry splendor of manufactured parade."—vol. i. pp. 198—200.

The intrigues of the Constable Bourbon are pursued at much length by Mr. Turner, and are illustrated by copious references to original despatches. We are by no means convinced, however,

that the extent of his discoveries respecting their connection with Henry VIII., is as great as he imagines.

“On the transactions of the celebrated Duke of Bourbon, the author has occupied a space which he has thought was not disproportioned to their novelty and importance in our annals. The peculiar connection of all his movements with English History has never been noticed before; and much which is developed in these pages from official papers, and from his own letters, will be found as new to the French nation as to our own. It has not been known before to our neighbours any more than to ourselves, as far as the writer has hitherto observed, that this personage, so famed as the Connetable du Bourbon, swore allegiance to Henry VIII. and engaged to make him King of France, and invaded it for that purpose; and was earnest, notwithstanding his failures, to renew and to consummate his project.”—Pref. p. ix.

Surely thus much is directly affirmed by Guicciardini; and although neither the time nor place at which Bourbon actually swore allegiance to Henry as future King of France, may have been precisely specified, there never could exist any doubt, from the words of the Italian Historian, that Henry, before his invasion of that country, in 1523, had received either such an assurance, or one fully equivalent to it, from the mouth, or under the hand, of the Constable. Guicciardini, in the commencement of his narrative of the conspiracy and revolt of Bourbon, (lib. xv.) expressly says, that he had *confederato pochi mesi innanzi con Cesare et col Ré d'Inghilterra CON PATTO*. Hence it was known that a positive *Treaty* existed; and a little onward he adds its terms, *di quello che s'acquistava haveva da ritenere per se la Provenza permutando il titolo di Conte al titolo di Re di Provenza, la qual Contea appartenerseglì per ragioni dependenti da gli Angioini pretendeva, l'altre cose tutte dovevano pervenire nel Re d'Inghilterra*; words which an author of such common occurrence as Hume has almost literally translated (xxix) without reference or acknowledgment. In the instructions also given to Dr. Sampson and Sir Richard Jerningham, to treat with the Emperor concerning Bourbon, the following marked passage occurs:—*Juramentumque Homagii et Fidelitatis a prefato Duce pro Nobis et Nomine Nostro quo ipse Nos pro vero Rege Franciæ recognoscet et acceptabit, Nobisque tanquam Rege Franciæ fideliter serviet atque obediet, et ad Mandata Nostra tanquam Supremi Domini sui et Regis Franciæ promptus et paratus erit, Recipiendi et Acceptandi*. This document which is preserved in the British Museum (Bibl. Cott. Vespasian, c. 2.) has been printed by Rymer, (*Fœdera* xiii. 794.) In point of fact, therefore, all the novelty which has been elicited by an examination of Pace's despatches, is resolved into an account of the particular method which was forced upon Bourbon, whereby

he was to pledge his faith. We do not think that such a discovery quite bears out the claim which has been made for it.

"The momentous consequences to Henry, to Europe, and to mankind, which ultimately followed from what the Duke of Bourbon from this time planned, directed or achieved, make the history of his defection an important part of the History of England, although from not being studied in the official documents that exist, its impressive connexion with our annals has hitherto been little noticed, and some of its most interesting incidents entirely unknown."—vol. i. p. 299.

The transactions at Pavia and the defeat and capture of Francis I. before that city, are related very clearly and much at large; and the particulars which Mr. Turner has skilfully combined from the standard authorities present an interesting picture. The following description of the personal behaviour of the gallant and unfortunate King is conveyed in spirited touches.

"In this irrecoverable state, his remaining army breaking all around him, the king made an effort to save himself by the bridge of the Ticino. The flying French all took that direction, pursued by their unsparing conquerors; but when they reached the river, they found, to their consternation, as Bonaparte at Leipsic, the bridge broken down. The fracture had been begun by the rabble, who had been driven out, that the Spaniards might not pursue them. The garrison of Pavia had completed the destruction; a doom of instant fate to thousands! Large bodies of the fugitives rushing on to reach it, perished in the river, as they trampled over its fragments; others were pushed into the stream by the impetuosity of their pursuers, and great numbers were slaughtered on its banks. Francis had arrived at the fatal spot, but to find no passage from it. He was soon surrounded by a concourse from which no valour could long extricate him. He fought with infuriated and unabating courage, wild with the disaster and disappointment, careless of death, and not unwilling to share it with his best friends who were falling in unavailing efforts to preserve him. He got out of the press a short time, but four Spanish arquebussiers pursued him. They knew not who he was, but they saw a rich dress, and the collar of St. Michael, and called upon him to surrender. He gave no answer, and striving to pass the outside one who had discharged his weapon, the man struck its butt end violently on his horse, which felled it. The king sank down with the dying animal into a ditch. As he fell, an officer, with some of Pescara's light cavalry, reached the spot, and marked his fine apparel. Not yet guessing the prize, but glancing at the ransom, he told the Spaniards they should share the booty if they would not kill him; Francis spoke not, nor was known. He was now lying insensible, oppressed by his horse. At this juncture Pomperand, the friend of Bourbon, and who had escaped with him, recognised his former sovereign, but concealing his knowledge, ordered the soldiers to pass on and pursue the victory, as their captive was already dead. The men then insisted on stripping him, when Pomperand, seeing the viceroy coming near, rode suddenly up to him, and



revealed the state of the King of France. Lannoy hurried to the spot, removed the dead bodies that had last perished to protect him, and raising him up from under his steed, recalled him to sensibility, asked him if he was the king, and desired him to surrender. Francis faintly inquired the rank of his questioner, and finding it to be the viceroy, said, that he surrendered himself to the emperor. The viceroy kissed his hand with great reverence, and as such received him. He was immediately disarmed to his hosen and jacket, and carefully examined. He had been struck by many balls on his breast-plate, but its strength had prevented their penetration. Two wounds only were observed on his face and hand. He was conducted from the bloody field to a monastery near Pavia, and there served respectfully at his refreshment by both the viceroy and Bourbon. The latter standing alone a long time reasoning with him, in answer to his reproaches."—vol. i. pp. 411—414.

Strange it is, that a pen which can write thus vividly and simply, should soon afterwards be delivered of such maudlin hypersentimentality as pules through the succeeding reflections on the King's imprisonment at Madrid.

"Escape was rendered as impossible as walls, seclusion, hourly examination, and personal inspection could make it, and Francis would have sunk to all the misery of despondence, but that until its reason fails, it is impossible for human nature to prevent the visitations of hope. This immortal child of imagination and desire, with the wings of a sylph, the voice of a syren, and the wand of an enchantress, mocks the power of the severest calamity, and will never be long absent with its inestimable consolations. It had sprung up anew in the bosom of Francis, on every proposition that had been suggested for his release; and though perishing as each was rejected, yet such is the magical nature of this divine associate of our intellectual essence, that it never dies but to revive, although it revives but to expire. The king's heart became sick with melancholy in Spain, at the vicissitudes and procrastination of the negotiations for his release, and more than one illness shook his frame as his captivity continued. But this unextinguishable comforter still upheld him; and that it might be thus operative, Charles at times sent him favourable messages; and when these no longer excited, and his indispositions became dangerous, roused fresh expectation by a courteous visit. Sweetest guest of the human heart, and the most constant friend of human life, hope is always whispering pleasure to us while it lives, and never disappoints us but to replace its fading flowers by newer blossoms and more alluring fruit. Reason may chide the mental fairy for its delusions, and moral satire may proscribe it as a dreamer and an enthusiast: yet what bosom would renounce the felicity it bestows; for it always exists with this glorious appendage, that in its sublimer range and final objects, it gives to earth-trained, but earth-spurning thought, an expansion, an elevation, a nobility, an aspiration, an energy, and a home, which link the grave with heaven, the heart with its Creator, and the spirit with His eternity."—vol. i. pp. 446, 447.

We now approach the really *English* portion of this History; to which, not a little to our surprize, Mr. Turner has allotted scarcely more than a third of his volumes. It is not our intention to follow him, page by page, in this well-known part of his narrative: we shall rather endeavour to produce instances in which he has successfully detected the mistaken or false representations of others, and to notice a few points on which we think he himself has written unadvisedly.

Whether the project of Divorce from Katharine of Arragon, originated with Wolsey or with Henry himself, is a question which now can never be decided. Mr. Turner argues stoutly for the first. But it is of little import. If Wolsey *did* suggest it, from State reasons combined with personal dislike, Henry willingly admitted that which, perhaps, already was not wholly strange to his mind; although he had contemplated it with widely different views from those entertained by the Cardinal. The hypocritical and revolting plea of conscience advanced by the Monarch, (for this appears to have been entirely his own,) in order to promote the gratification of one passion, was readily adopted by the Minister to forward the hopes of another; so that the ambition of the wily Statesman unwittingly pandered to the lust of the Royal suitor. Little did Wolsey perceive at the time in which he was soliciting the hand of the Princess Renée, (for the attainment of which the Divorce was indispensable,) that his master's affections were fixed elsewhere, and that opposition to them would eventually work his own downfall.

The return of Anne Boleyn to England, is assigned by Mr. Turner, on very reasonable grounds, to the Spring of the same year (1527) during the summer of which Wolsey proceeded on this bootless matrimonial embassy. Dr. Lingard, indeed, strives to show that it took place five years earlier; but then he *appears* to throw together, as if they had taken place simultaneously, three occurrences of which the dates are very widely removed from each other: namely, the elevation of her father to the dignity of Viscount Rochford, (in 1525,) the rupture which the King effected between the lady and her admirer, Lord Percy, (in 1527,) and a present to her of jewels from the royal hand, which is fixed by a letter accompanying them, in May, 1528. The removal of Lord Percy from Court was, as Dr. Lingard surmises, the first hint which Anne received of the impression which she had made on the King's heart. Now, if she returned in 1522, as he wishes it to be believed, she whom Henry afterwards loved so passionately, and to whom he sacrificed so largely, must have filled, during five years, a prominent situation in his Court without attracting his attention. Princes are not usually very solicitous to conceal their

hopes of female encouragement, nor are those to whom they are addressed often backward in perceiving them: yet we have the express testimony of Cavendish, that even after Lord Percy had been commanded to avoid her, "she knew nothing of the King's intended purpose;" and the dismay of Wolsey on learning it, soon after his arrival from France, proves his own ignorance of an attachment which no one was more deeply interested in knowing, and which, if it had really existed, could scarcely have been concealed from his penetration.

The calumnies of Saunders against the youthful reputation of Anne, are so overcharged as to defeat their own purpose. They are disclaimed on all hands, and it is, therefore, unnecessary to refute them here. If it were not so, Mr. Turner has furnished sufficient arguments for the purpose, both from the close paternal vigilance and high and honourable character of Sir Thomas Boleyn, and from the unimpeachable morals of the two Courts in which herself held distinguished appointments. These slanders have not been re-asserted by Dr. Lingard; who, however, has given but a faint denial to another infamous charge, that Lady Boleyn had been the secret mistress of Henry; and in one place, with the intention of implying that a still fouler accusation existed, has studiously termed Anne "the daughter of Lady Boleyn." Nor has he scrupled to state, positively and without qualification, that Anne's elder sister, Mary, had lived openly with the King in concubinage. This scandal is rested upon a paragraph in what Dr. Lingard terms a *private letter* from Cardinal Pole to Henry; a paragraph which, most probably, Dr. Lingard has never seen, unless at secondhand; since it occurs, as Mr. Turner has shown, not in a *private letter*, but in the *published* tract, *Pro Eccl. Un. Def.* Upon the strength of this sentence, Anne is represented by Dr. Lingard as "supplanting" Mary in the royal affections, and as throughout manifesting entire willingness to marry the brutal seducer, who, as she well knew, had *violated* (such is Pole's expression) her own sister.

That Pole is not always to be trusted is clearly shown by Mr. Turner in another important instance, which it is not possible to divest of the character of deliberate falsehood. In the Treatise already cited, he affirms that Henry confessed to the Emperor that the marriage of Katharine with his Brother Arthur had not been consummated. Whether the fact was so or not, it is not here necessary to inquire. All History vouches that Henry asserted the consummation. A document still exists in the State Paper Office, in which it is distinctly notified in his own hand writing—*ce parfait consummation ensuyvy*—it was so pertinaciously adhered to by Henry on all occasions of which we have any record, and



manifestly was of such importance to the success of his suit for Divorce, that it is quite incredible to suppose he ever should confess the falsehood of this assertion to the very person of all others, whom it was most his interest to convince of its truth.

So much for Pole's general authority; but, in the particular instance before us, Mr. Turner has given yet stronger proof of the little credit which he deserves.

"Such a connection, if a fact, must have been known like all other facts, and as such, either seen by Pole, or learnt by him from those who saw or knew it. But instead of stating it from personal observation or information, he says expressly, that he learnt it from neither. He refers it to the pope, who being such an interested and bitter adversary, can only be the most suspicious of all authorities. 'Verum, quo pacto ego hoc scio.' 'But by what means do I know this? because at the same time at which thou rejectedst the papal dispensation for thy brother's wife, thou contendedst with great force from the same pope, that it might be lawful for thee to marry the sister of her who had been thy concubine.' p. 267. But we have a full account of the letters to the pope, and of the discussions about it before him, in the official papers from Wolsey and the ambassadors to Rome, and no parts of them mention it. That such a thing should not be known by Pole in or from England, but nine years afterwards be learnt from Rome, are such circumstances as ought to nullify any tale of slander that is not otherwise supported.

"But Pole incapacitates himself from any credibility on the subject, by his mode of stating it. The last passage is part of a paragraph that begins with charging Henry with falsely pretending that a religious scruple actuated him against Katharine's marriage. Pole seriously commences this charge with saying, it was *revealed* to him from heaven that this was a false pretence: 'Mihi a Deo revelatum esse.' But in his very next sentence he convicts himself of a falsehood in this assertion, and utters what we should call derangement in any existing writer: 'But in what manner did God reveal this to me? not, indeed, by himself as he has often done many things to many, but by that very adulteress whom thou brought into thy wife's bed.' p. 266. Thus this asserted revelation from heaven sinks down into an assertion of information from Anne Boleyn. But did Anne Boleyn really tell him so? no such a thing. For instead of affirming it to be so, he shifts it away into another contradiction: 'I say that she laid open all thy mind to me. How? sayest thou. I will tell thee, if thou wilt first answer me the things I am going to ask thee.' p. 266. He then makes the charge about the sister, and the application to the pope, and adds this nullification of the whole: 'Did she not then herself, most plainly show what thy mind was. Did not God by her person, *she being silent*, make it certain to all that thou talkedst of the law that thou might obey thy appetite, not thy divine command.' p. 267.

"Thus he first says, that heaven revealed this to him; then, that it did not reveal it, but that Anne Boleyn told him. Then that Anne never said a word to him on the subject, but that heaven had made it certain

to him by the application for the papal dispensation. If this be not aberration of mind, I can only say it is an incomprehensible mystification. But that any person of common sense or equity should repeat such a charge on such an authority, only shows how gratified some minds allow themselves to be with another's defamation."—vol. ii. pp. 431, 432.

To this statement we will not add more than a single question. Is the revival of a charge imputing such complicated infamy and guilt to two innocent women, without a hint that it is open even to suspicion, consistent with the pretensions of an author, who talks loudly of "fidelity and research," and professes "to take nothing upon credit," and "TO DISTRUST THE STATEMENTS OF PARTIAL AND INTERESTED WRITERS?"\*

"Anne," continues Dr. Lingard, still reasoning upon his false assumption, "had derived a useful lesson from the fate of her sister Mary. She *artfully* kept her lover in suspense; but tempered her resistance with so many blandishments, that his hopes, though repeatedly disappointed, were never totally extinguished." In opposition to this imaginary picture of finished coquetry, let us turn to a contemporary account brought forward by Mr. Turner.

"According to the account believed at the time, and transmitted to us by one of her adversaries, and therefore more credible, on Henry's first solicitations, she fell on her knees and made this answer: 'I think, most noble and worthy king! your majesty speaks these words in mirth to prove me, without intent of defiling of your princely self. Therefore, to ease you of that labour in asking me any such question hereafter, I beseech your highness most earnestly, if you do not rest, to take this my answer, which I speak from the depth of my soul, in good part. Most noble king! I will rather lose my life than my virtue, which shall be the greatest and the best part of the dowry that I shall bring my husband.' He met these sentiments with a declaration that he should not abandon hope—a natural feeling to one possessed of his splendid advantages, and daily conscious of their possession. Her reply was as creditable to her good sense, as to the spirit of true honour which was influencing her mind: 'I understand not, most mighty king, how you should retain any such hope. Your wife I cannot be, both in respect of my own unworthiness, and also because you have a queen already; and your strumpet I will not be.'"—vol. ii. pp. 195, 196.

The authority of the contemporary slanderers of Anne Boleyn is adopted or neglected by her later traducers as best suits their purpose. In one place we are presented with passages from Cardinal Pole declaratory of her innocence, *Concubina enim tua fieri, pudica mulier nolebat; uxor volebat.—Illa, cujus amore Rex deperibat, pertinacissimè negabat sui corporis potestatem, nisi matrimonio conjunctam, se illi unquam facere.* In another place we are told, by Dr. Lingard himself, that "five years had now rolled

\* Lingard, *Advertisement* to vol. iv. 4to.

away since Henry had first solicited a Divorce; three since *he had begun to cohabit* with Anne Boleyn." But the defence of her maiden honour may be safely left to Mr. Turner, who has supported it ably and conclusively—not so her remaining Tragedy. His impressions respecting the charges which brought her to the block, appear to be in her favour, and he adduces many facts by which these impressions are strengthened: but well aware that if she is once proved innocent, there is no longer any chance for her murderer, he never permits either his impressions or his evidence to produce their full effect upon his judgment. We shall put together a few of the contradictory passages which exhibit his perplexity.

From an extract of the Commission of her Trial, among the Birch MSS. in the British Museum, (4293,) Mr. Turner thus states the charges against her and comments upon them.

"These were, that she had affected several of the king's daily servants, and by base colloquies, kisses, touches, gifts and other incitations, procured their intimacy. The dates they found, have the suspicious appearance of being placed far back, and at distance from each other; whereas actual profligacy is more likely to have been recent and frequent. Thus, as to Norris; on 6th October, 1533, the '*dulcibus verbis, osculis, tactibus,*' are stated, and on the 12th the offence. As to Brereton, the allurements are dated 5th December, 1533, and the crime the 8th, at Hampton Court. As to Sir Francis Weston, the incitation is put the 8th May, 1534, and the fact on the 20th. As to Mark Smeeton, one of the grooms of the chamber, the invitation is on the 2d April, 1535, and the transgression the 26th. And as to her brother, the dates are 2d and 5th November, 1536. MS. *ib.* That her offences should be with four of her daily attendants, and yet be only specified to have occurred twice in 1533, once in 1534, and once in 1535, four times only in three years, and therefore no repetition with Norris and Brereton, in the last three years, nor with Weston for two years, nor with Smeeton in the preceding twelve months, and none at all in the last five months of her reign:—these circumstances do not resemble those of a true case, nor suit the natural conduct of a shameless woman. I have more doubt of her criminality since I met with this specifying record, than I had before. The regular distinctions between the days of allurement and the days of offence are very like the made up facts of a fabricated accusation."—vol. ii. p. 444, n.

"They who saw and heard her defence," he continues, "judged her innocent."—"The Lord Mayor afterwards remarked to some of his friends, that he could not observe any thing in the proceedings against her, but that they were resolved to seek occasion to get rid of her."—The out-door rumour was, that she had cleared herself; and her acquittal was expected. He dismisses the foul accusation of incest with just indignation; and yet it was upon



this accusation that Lord Rochford was condemned and suffered. The following nice balance of probabilities concludes his summary :—

“ Anne Boleyn has, on the whole, been severely dealt with by many, and even by some of her own sex—pardonably indeed by them; because female virtue is so beautiful in itself; every instance of it in elevated rank is so honourable to womanhood; its courtly models were then so rare; its purity at all times is so delicate; its reputation so precious; its value so inestimable; and its abandonment by any so depreciating to all, that we can easily forgive the female sensibility which will not pardon the offenders who break or weaken a talisman which makes their sex so attractive, so superior, and so subduing; but yet candour is bound to recollect, that this lady was outrageously attacked before her nuptial fidelity was suspected, merely because she was Henry's queen; that the partizans of the old system were deeply interested to depose and disgrace her; that his mutability was giving her enemies an assisting opportunity; that though her splendid prosperity was making her careless and presuming, yet indecorous freedoms are nor actual vice; that female politics have sometimes attempted to revive decaying regard by exciting jealousy: that many have been precipitately, and some in all ages most unjustly accused; and that if appearances justify suspicion, they do not prove the commission of criminality. Nothing indeed can be allowed to excuse that offence, which blights the sweetest confidence of human society, and undermines one of its most upholding pillars. But before we throw down Anne Boleyn among the worthless of her sex, we must not forget that while we have her indictment and her conviction, we have none of the evidence by which we can ourselves appreciate the justice of either; and one authority, impressive because coming from a foreigner, who must have been guilty of wilful and gratuitous mendacity, if his assertion be false, has transmitted to us the assurance, from many Englishmen, that Henry himself, as he approached his own death-bed, expressed regrets for his severity against her. But as the destruction of the papers which detailed her trial precludes the attainment now of any greater certainty on the subject, than these pages have exhibited, the mind that wishes to be impartial after reviewing all the circumstances that have reached us, will perhaps incline to think that a state of academical neutrality as to her guilt, is preferable to either a belief or a denial of its existence; admitting at the same time that she may have been an instance of the justness of Ganganelli's remark, that the virtues in some persons are too often but like flashes of lightning, which shine and disappear in the horizon they illuminate. If Polydore Vergil believed her guilty, Melancthon hesitated to think so. That Smeeton should plead guilty; and that two grand juries of gentlemen of different counties should have seen evidence enough on one side to put the four individuals, who had no privilege of peerage, on their trials; that a common jury of another class of persons, on hearing the whole case, should have given their verdict of conviction on such an arraignment; and that the House of Lords, the highest order of subjects in the nation, should attain her also on the same charge and

circumstances—present such a concurrence of judgments upon oath and honour, of both the nobility, gentry, and others of the land, as to compel us, however unwilling, to hesitate before we can discredit what they united to think was sufficiently proved. But at the same time when we recollect on the other hand, the absence of such direct proof as would have satisfied bystanders, and precluded doubt; the improbability that she would have risked the forfeiture of such exalted rank; the constancy of her previous virtue, during six years severe probation; the king's jealousy of his honour, and certain indignation; the peril of the crime; the continual probability of its detection; her searching examinations adding no discovery; her solemn denials; her exculpation by Norris; her courageous death; her general good conduct; and her public character;—the balance fluctuates as we hold it; judgment pauses, and every honourable feeling seems to urge us to leave the question in that charitable uncertainty with which time, accidents, and history have combined to involve it.”—vol. ii. pp. 457—460.

And yet, after resolving to continue in this “charitable uncertainty,” (and be it remembered that *uncertainty* concerning a woman's honour is always destructive of it,) he writes in a subsequent page that Henry's *affections* and *virtuous disposition* led him to place his private happiness in marriage; that he was not in truth, as he has been described, “the nursery Blue Beard both of the throne and the nuptial state;” that “accident not malignity brought the ascription of this character upon him,” for that his *second* and *fifth* wives “*disgraced themselves and produced their own destruction.*”

But enough of this anility. Our limits will not permit us to abridge the strong presumptive evidence which Mr. Turner produces in proof that Pole's reluctance to accept the Cardinal's Hat, arose from his secret and long cherished hope of obtaining a more splendid prize, the English Crown. But we must not omit one important correction, which is furnished of Dr. Lingard's counter hypothesis. That writer attributes Pole's tardiness to a strong desire to avoid the resentment with which he knew that Henry would receive the information of his preferment by the Papal Court. Yet Dr. Lingard could not possibly be ignorant that this supposition must fall to the ground, on a comparison of dates. It was not until the 22d of December, 1535, that Pole was invested with the dignity of the Cardinalship; and so little regard had he for the resentment of his Cousin, that already, in the previous Spring, he had written and *circulated among his friends*, the most furious and defamatory invective against Henry, which ever issued from the armoury of Polemics.

Look now again upon the different pictures with which we are presented of Pole's Legations. Dr. Lingard remarks, “*It has been said that, in accepting this mission, he sought to induce the*

Emperor and the King of France to make war upon Henry, and that he even indulged a hope of being able to obtain the Crown for himself as a descendant of the House of York. *These charges are satisfactorily refuted by his official and confidential correspondence:* but at the same time it is plain that one of his objects was to confirm, by his residence in Flanders, the attachment of the Northern Counties to the ancient Faith, to supply, if it were necessary, the leaders of the malcontents with money, and to obtain for them the favour and protection of the neighbouring powers." If Cardinal Pole's correspondence refutes the *on dits* noticed by Dr. Lingard in the commencement of the extract, it also refutes, for ought we see to the contrary, Dr. Lingard's own admissions in the conclusion of it; for we perceive little difference between the two, and indeed in a note a little onward, is something more to the same purpose; "Pole, to excuse his conduct in the legation, assures Edward VI. that his chief object was to induce those Princes (the Emperor and King of France,) to employ all their interest with Henry in favour of Religion: but acknowledges that he wished them, in case the King refused to listen to them as friends, to add menaces, and to interrupt the commerce with his subjects.—He might indeed have hoped that these measures would persuade or intimidate Henry; but he must also have known, that if they had been pursued, they would lead to discontent within the kingdom and war without: and that such results were contemplated by those who employed him."

Little more than that which Pole avows to have been his object was intended in our times, by Mr. Theobald Wolfe Tone—and if any doubt remain as to the moral or legal character of the act, we may clear it away by Mr. Turner's plainer statement:—

"That the elevation of Pole to the cardinal dignity was not meant to be a sinecure of compliment or an asylum of indolence, appears from the commands he received, to become immediately the instrument of treason, rebellion, and ingratitude, against his king and patron. The simple fact needs no epithets. The words of his biographer display the truth; and when that is clear, it is always most emphatic. 'A few days afterwards he was named legate, with orders to go into France and Flanders, to excite the Catholics, in England, to whom the emperor and the king of France had promised much favour.'"—vol. ii. p. 466, n.

"Pole sufficiently implies the business he meant to pursue on this mission; and at Liege, in his letter to the pope from Cambray, 18th May, 1537, after calling those who were against him in London 'the malignants,' he says, alluding to the insurrections, 'when I departed from Rome, the people were in tumults for the cause of religion, and had active and noble men their leaders. Nothing then seemed likely to give greater spirits to the people, than to hear that one of their own countrymen was coming with authority who would help their cause; nothing



would bring greater terror to their adversaries, nor more easily draw them to more equitable conditions.' *Poli. Epist.* p. 52. In another part, he mentions, that 'the insurrection of the people who favoured that cause, had been appeased, so that many were executed, and all their leaders in the king's power. I heard of its being put down when I came to Lyons.' *ib.* p. 51. After giving the reasons for his being recalled, he adds, as one on the other side for his staying; 'a quick departure would bring despair on these people who ought to be chiefly thought of, and the greatest security to the adversaries. If some one should watch perpetually for all opportunities in his regions, to be ready, as often as occasion should emerge, it would be the best thing for the church, and unless we would entirely lose that island, we must do so.' p. 53. 'Nothing is more fit than that some one should remain in their sight, by whose example, authority, and suasion, as occasion should present itself, one who would be ready not so much, 'tam verbo quam re,' to undergo all extremes in body, *they might be moved.*' *ib.* p. 54. On 21st August, 1537, he wrote to Contareni, from Liege, that the government of England was so odious, that nothing could be more infirm than its condition. *ib.* p. 88. Either this conduct was treason, or treason ceases to be such if it be done at the command or in favour of the pope."—vol. ii. p. 470, n.

It is by no means improbable, although there certainly is no proof in existence to this effect, that the different members of Pole's family who suffered in 1539, were really implicated in his treasons. But what is to be pleaded in behalf of that vindictive bloodthirstiness which brought to public execution, after an imprisonment of more than two years, his mother, the last scion of the noblest stock in England, a woman and a septuagenarian? Even Mr. Turner "*regrets*" this severity; Mr. Turner, who, in order to extenuate the guilt of the Tyrant, has pronounced that Fisher and More were traitors; and who has maintained that the latter, (whom he pronounces to have been something "between a Monk and a Voltaire,") but for the violence of his death, long since "would have sunk into oblivion, except as a punster, as a worthy pattern of domestic virtues, and as one who had been fond of Literature!"

Here we must close; for we cannot scarce trust ourselves to follow the panegyric paragraphs on Henry. Mr. Turner thinks it is a pity that he did not learn that "mercy and magnanimity are the most substantial pillars of assaulted power;" "for besides the naturally disarming agencies of forgiving clemency, it links us with that potentiality whose alliance can impart irresistible security." He continues:—

"None of these severities were inflicted without the due legal authority. The verdicts of juries; the solemn judgment of the peers, or attainders by both houses of parliament on offences proved to its satisfaction; pronounced all the convictions, and pronounced the fatal sentence. Every

one was approved and sanctioned by the cabinet council of the government. The king is responsible only for adopting the harsh system; for not interposing his prerogative of mercy, and for signing the death warrants, which ordered the legal sentences to be put in force. He punished no one tyrannically, without trial or legal condemnation."—vol. ii. p. 518.

As if Henry was one whit less despotic than the Cæsars, or as if any Court dared acquit the victims whom he sent before it already bound for sacrifice!

In one sentence we heartily coincide, although perhaps we might have couched it in different words; that "it is mere vanity of phrase to represent him *as an Apollo Belvidere* of the throne." This perhaps will satisfy our readers. Mr. Turner's work is highly valuable on account of the materials and guideposts which it furnishes; and we heartily wish that before it descended from quarto to octavo, some judicious friend had recommended curtailment, and advised him to retain his facts, and suppress his reasonings.

ART. IX.—*Origines; or Remarks on the Origin of several Empires, States and Cities.* By the Right Honourable Sir William Drummond. Vol. III. Baldwin and Co. 1826. 12s.

THE appearance of this Third Volume reminds us that our Review of the two former was confined to one department of the learned Author's researches. We endeavoured to prove that etymology is not a safe guide to historical truth, even when we are well acquainted with the languages which we use for that purpose; and, consequently, that it must become extremely fallacious, in all cases where our knowledge does not keep pace with the conclusions which we attempt to found upon the slender basis of verbal analysis. There is no reason for concealing that the remark now made was suggested to us by certain unequivocal proofs that Sir William Drummond, in many instances, seemed disposed to push his arguments a great deal farther than his proficiency in Eastern tongues appeared to warrant. In short, we did not think it necessary to withhold our opinion that the etymological disquisitions were the least perfect, and the most unsatisfactory part of his work; deficient in grammatical accuracy in the detail, and not remarkable for logical precision in the application.

It was with much greater pleasure that we referred to the sounder learning which is displayed in such chapters of the

Origines as are devoted to Geography and Chronology. On these subjects Sir William has not written without due research; for which reason, we most willingly acknowledge that, though there are many points on which our conclusions may not exactly coincide with his, there is no topic discussed by him, in regard to dates, genealogies, and geographical boundaries, which does not call for that praise which is due to enlightened and persevering inquiry. In following his footsteps through these intricate fields of investigation, we shall not confine ourselves to the volume now before us; but taking in the scope of his whole work, and more especially as it respects chronological tenets, endeavour to make the reader acquainted with what is new in the *Origines*; wherein the Author differs from his predecessors; the evidence upon which he rests his principal opinions; and lastly, the validity and consistency of his general results.

We begin with the Assyrian Empire; the chronology of which occupies a considerable portion of the First Volume. In this arrangement, it is true, we do not exactly observe the order which Sir William has himself adopted; his first cares having been bestowed upon the history of the Babylonians, who, in point of fact, were an older nation than the descendants of Asshur. But it will be found, as we advance, that the annals of the more modern people comprehend those of the more ancient; for in this case, as in many others, we attain our object most securely by commencing our search in full light, and by gradually receding into ground where our footing necessarily becomes more uncertain and obscure.

In respect to the origin of the Assyrian monarchy, then, our most important testimony is derived from the writings of Moses; who in the tenth chapter of the Book of Genesis informs us, that Asshur went out of the land of Shinar "and builded Nineveh and the City Rehoboth, and Calah, and Resen between Nineveh and Calah." It is stated in the same record, that Babylon was already founded, and that Nimrod had even established there the beginning of a regular government on monarchical principles. But the sacred historian supplies us with no such facts as might enable us to trace the progress of society in those early times; to determine the genealogy of the several ruling families; or to ascertain the names of the kings who first governed those fine countries which are watered by the Tigris and Euphrates, the order of their succession, and the length of their reigns. The purposes of the inspired volume did not require so minute a narrative of mere secular events.

For such particulars we are chiefly indebted to Ctesias and Herodotus; the former of whom, having lived a great many years



at the court of Artaxerxes Mnemon, had access to the archives of the Persian empire; from which he copied a list of all the sovereigns who had reigned over western Asia, from the foundation of the monarchy down to the conquests of Cyrus. His catalogues have been preserved in the volumes of Eusebius and of Georgius Syncellus; according to which the duration of the Assyrian kingdom varies from 1300 to 1360, and even 1460 years. Herodotus, on the other hand, asserts that the Assyrian power had not been established in Upper Asia more than 520 years at the time when it was dissolved or weakened by the rebellion of Arbaces the Mede. Let it be remarked, however, in passing, that Herodotus does not maintain that the empire of the Assyrians had no existence at an earlier period than 520 years before its dissolution, but merely that its dominion did not sooner extend itself over the Upper Asia. Viewed in the light of this obvious distinction, the narrative of Herodotus will not appear inconsistent with the chronological lists of Ctesias.

But most of those who have written on this subject, whether in France or England, have chosen to take part with one of those ancient authors against the other, and even to represent their conclusions as incompatible and contradictory. Hence it has been customary to rally round the standard of Ctesias or of Herodotus, according to the bearings of the several hypotheses which, from time to time, have risen into favour among the learned; and, particularly since the days of Marsham and Newton, who, it is well known, exerted all the power of their erudition and genius in support of the abbreviated system of chronology. In pursuance of this object, the former of these great men made a furious attack on the veracity of Ctesias, whom, on the authority of some ancient philosophers, he described as a weak, a credulous, an ignorant and a dishonest historian.

It cannot be denied that Aristotle, Pliny and Plutarch, did pronounce some very severe strictures on the writings of Ctesias, and accuse him of such imbecility, or easiness of belief, as could not fail to render his works altogether undeserving of credit. But it ought to be observed, at the same time, that the remarks of those profound thinkers applied only to the historical compositions of Ctesias, and particularly to a treatise of this kind on India, which is said to have contained many fabulous recitals. He had lent his ear too readily to stories of monsters, and of wonderful exploits, and therefore drew down upon himself the contempt of these distinguished naturalists and elegant writers; but it does not appear that they ever called in question his fidelity as a chronologist, or threw out any suspicion against the integrity of his Assyrian Catalogues. Ctesias, when copying a list of

names, had no temptation to indulge his genius for the marvellous; on which account we may freely repose in him that confidence which his writings procured for him on the part of Diodorus Siculus, Julius Africanus, Eusebius and Syncellus.

The fall of the Assyrian empire is usually dated in the year 747 before the Christian era, when Sardanapalus was deprived of his life and throne: to ascertain, therefore, the period at which the first monarch began to reign, we have only to add 1300, 1360, or 1460 years to the epoch already determined. Let us assume 1300, the number generally preferred; which, added to 747, gives 2047, for the accession of Ninus, who is always placed at the top of the list of Assyrian rulers. Adopting, with Sir William Drummond, the computation of the Septuagint, the reign of Ninus will be found to have commenced more than 1100 years after the flood; an interval which, from its length, cannot but appear to be inconsistent with the Mosaical narrative, and the early formation of society in the plain of Shinar.

This consideration leads us to a point at issue between Sir William and some of the more ancient chronographers. Julius Africanus, for example, relates that two dynasties, consisting of thirteen princes, reigned at Babylon before Ninus ascended the throne of Assyria. The race of Belus or Nimrod terminated at the seventh generation; after which the throne of Chaldæa was occupied by an Arabian family, six of whom reigned in succession, until at length Babylonia was conquered by the Assyrian king already named; who, joining it to his dominions, extended his sceptre over all the provinces between the Euphrates and the Tigris. In a word, that there was a kingdom established at Babylon 400 or 500 years before the Assyrian empire was founded in the house of Ninus, is an opinion which was almost unanimously held by the learned, till about the end of the seventeenth century; when Sir John Marsham published his *Canon Chronicus*, and started doubts in regard to the accuracy of the Greek historians and chronologers.

The principal authorities, whose lights we must follow in this investigation, are Alexander Polyhistor and Africanus, who appear to have copied, from more ancient writers, the result of inquiries the date of which is lost in the darkness of a very remote antiquity. These two authors agree in respect to the number of kings who succeeded Nimrod at Babylon, though they differ somewhat as to the length of time which was occupied by their successive reigns. Alexander Polyhistor assigns to the first dynasty of Chaldæan monarchs a period only of 190 years, while Africanus and Syncellus extend it to 225. The Arabians, again, are represented by both as having held the throne 215 years, when

they were compelled to retire before the rising fortunes of the celebrated Ninus.

During those 440 years, in the course of which the strength and magnificence of the Babylonian monarchy must have grown to a considerable height, no mention is made by any one writer, sacred or profane, of the Assyrian kingdom or colony which was founded by Asshur at Nineveh, Rehoboth and Calah. But there is every reason to believe that the sources of its prosperity were neither less ample nor less constant than those which contributed to augment the parent state; for we find that, when Ninus did appear, he carried with him into the field a degree of power which at once enabled him to associate his name, in eastern annals, with the first rise of that ascendancy which the Assyrians so long maintained among the nations of Asia.

But Sir William Drummond denies that there was any Babylonian kingdom before the rise of the Assyrian power in the days of Ninus. He attempts to destroy all the evidence that exists for a Chaldean monarchy between the times of Nimrod and Ninus, by adducing proof that the latter was the son of the former, and consequently that they lived in the same age. He does not, indeed, direct his reasoning against the historical positions maintained by Polyhistor, Eusebius, Africanus and Syncellus, respecting the ancient dynasties which are supposed to have ruled at Babylon. He takes no notice whatever of their opinions on this head; but, by undertaking to prove that Ninus was the immediate descendant and successor of the grandson of Ham, he manifests a desire to supersede the inquiry altogether, as either trifling or absurd, and thereby to obliterate from the page of history the proper monarchy of Nimrod, as well as the catalogue of sixteen or seventeen princes who followed him in the government of Babylon.

It is perfectly clear, he maintains, from the Book of Genesis, that Nimrod and Ninus were contemporaries; for Nineveh, which signifies the habitation of Nin or Ninus, was built in the time of Nimrod. This argument is far from being conclusive. From the incidental manner in which the foundation of Nineveh is alluded to by the sacred historian, we are not justified in determining the precise date at which it rose into the capital of an empire. Nothing more is stated in the text than that, at some period after the occupation of Babylon by Nimrod, a chief named Asshur went out of that country into a more northern district, in which were subsequently built no fewer than four considerable cities. It is not to be imagined that the head of a small body of colonists would at once resolve to employ the strength and patience of his followers in the very useless task of erecting



four large towns, for which there were no inhabitants. Most writers, accordingly, considering that the building of cities is the work of time, and not likely to be accomplished in the first moment of settlement by rude tribes who had to derive their subsistence from a large extent of uncultivated territory, have inferred from the inspired narrative nothing more particular than that Assyria was originally peopled by emigrants from Babylonia: and that their descendants erected certain large towns which, in the days of the Jewish Lawgiver, were celebrated among eastern nations for their strength and magnificence. Nor does it certainly follow that the name, by which Nineveh was known in the time of Moses, was the appellation given to it by its earliest founders. Nothing is more common than for cities to undergo a change of name, or a change of circumstances; wherefore, we reject the conclusion of Sir William Drummond in regard to the age of Ninus, and deny that he was the son or contemporary of Nimrod. The holy record, we maintain, does not assert that Ninus built Nineveh. On the contrary, we are assured by Moses that the capital of Assyria owed its foundation to an emigrant from Babylonia, whose name was Asshur; whence it is manifest that he who asserts Nimrod and Ninus to have been contemporaries, merely because a certain city was built by Asshur in the days of the former, is chargeable with a gross violation of logic.

Nor is Sir William more fortunate in the second attempt which he makes to rest his argument on the basis of Scripture. He concludes that Nimrod was the master of Assyria as well as of Babylonia, and that Ninus was his son and successor; "because," says he, "the prophet Micah calls Assyria the land of Nimrod." But whoever reads his Bible with attention will find that the prophet, so far from calling Assyria the land of Nimrod, makes a marked distinction between it and Babylonia; saying, "and they shall waste the land of Assyria with the sword, *and* the land of Nimrod, in the entrances thereof:" that is, according to the commenting of Leclerc, they shall subdue Assyria and Babylonia with arms—"armis domabunt Assyriam et Babyloniam." Indeed this passage of Micah has hitherto been quoted, as far as we know, only by those authors whose object it was to prove, that the monarchies of Babylon and Assyria were not only different in their origin, but that the former alone had ever acknowledged the authority of Nimrod. That the Hebrew language will not admit of the particle which is translated *and* being rendered by the word *even*, we are not prepared to deny; but that it has not been so rendered by the Septuagint, nor by any of the most approved critics in modern times, is well known to every biblical scholar. In truth, it is only those whose opinions coincide with the strange

notion of Bochart, that Asshur meant a country and not a man, who imagine that Nimrod, after founding Babylon, carried out a colony to plant Assyria.

The error into which Sir William has fallen, respecting the age of Ninus, leads him into another in regard to the time of Nimrod. 'This mighty hunter is described in Scripture as the grandson of Ham, the son of Noah; that is, as occupying a place in the third generation from the father of the renovated world. But as there is still extant good historical evidence for the fact that Ninus and Abraham were contemporaries, and as Sir William has satisfied himself that Ninus and Nimrod lived at the same time, it follows of course that Nimrod and Abraham must have been contemporaries,—a conclusion which, we have no hesitation to say, is equally inconsistent with the Bible, and with all the writings of profane antiquity.

That Ninus and Abraham were nearly of the same generation, and lived at the same period, is a truth which is established by the best historians and chronologers among the Greeks. Both of them flourished in the eleventh century after the flood. But where do we find any authority for postponing the era of Nimrod so long, and placing him a thousand years after his grandfather? To this question the ingenious author of the *Origines* answers as follows:

“That Abraham and Nimrod were contemporaries is not contradicted by the Scriptures, and is affirmed by various writers, whose authority is of weight in such a question. This fact, then, is asserted by the authors of the *Gemara*, or commentary on the *Mishna*, by the author of the *Targum* on the *Pentateuch* ascribed to Jonathan, and by several eminent Rabbins of later date. The Arabians held a similar tradition: and the historians Achmedibn-Jusuf, Mahummed Mustapha, and Al-Grannabi, speak of the patriarch as contemporary with the tyrant and robber. The commentators on the *Koran* have indeed abundantly embroidered this tradition, as have done also the authors of the Persian books called *Malim* and *Sophi Ibrahim*. But while we reject this extravagant exaggeration, we may admit these authors to have been right in considering Abraham and Nimrod as contemporaries.”—*Origines*, vol. i. p. 98.

But had this learned orientalist called to mind the great difference in the two schemes of chronology pursued by the Jewish writers, and by himself respectively, he could not have ascribed to their opinion the weight which he has been pleased to give to it. According to the genealogical notion of the Hebrew Bible, which is adopted by the Rabbis, Abraham was born in the 292d year after the flood: whereas, agreeably to the computation of the Seventy, which is approved by Sir William, the son of Terah did not come into the world till the year 1070, reckoning from the

same point. It is very obvious, therefore, that though the authors of the *Gemara* and *Targum* might, in complete consistency with their chronological views, maintain that Abraham and Nimrod were contemporaries, the same opinion ought not to be held by a writer, who not only refuses to concur in the conclusions of their chronology, but even directly accuses them of diminishing to the extent of 700 years, the very period under consideration, that, namely, from the flood to the birth of Abraham.

Is there any one, then, who does not clearly perceive that Sir William Drummond has called in the aid of an auxiliary, with whom he does not hold one point in common? The Rabbis believe that Nimrod began to rule early in the second century of the new world, and that Abraham was born towards the close of the third; and as the life of man at that remote period usually exceeded 200 years, it was not unreasonable on their part to suppose that the latter had attained to some degree of maturity before the other was called away by death. But the distinguished archæologist whose work we are now examining, maintains that the progenitor of the Hebrews was not born before the end of the tenth century at the soonest: and yet he adduces the authority of the Jewish commentators in support of the opinion that this patriarch was contemporary with another personage, who, according to them, existed about 700 years before him. In short, to have rendered the testimony of the Rabbis of any use to his hypothesis, Sir William should first have shown that they agreed with him in adding 700 years to the period which elapsed between the flood and the nativity of the patriarch; for unless he meets them on this common ground, their authority not only goes for nothing, but actually places itself in direct opposition to the very point which, by means of it, he wishes to establish. None of the Rabbinical writers admit that the birth of Nimrod was delayed till 1,000 years after the universal deluge. The reader, therefore, who has bestowed upon these considerations the attention to which they lay claim, will hardly accede to the conclusion which the author founds upon his reasoning, namely, that the evidence which proves Nimrod, Ninus and Abraham to have been contemporaries, is too strong to be set aside.

But there is a further inconsistency in the opinion entertained by Sir William. If Nimrod did not live till the days of Abraham, it will follow that the Babylonian monarchy, instead of being the first of the kingdoms which were established after the renovation of the human race, must have been posterior to Egypt and several others. The accomplished author himself allows that the state of society in the time of Abraham argues its long previous existence. Powerful kingdoms were already established; great cities



had been built; and regular armies had been maintained. Mankind already witnessed the pomp of courts and the luxury of individuals. Pharaoh appeared surrounded with his princes; Abimelech came attended by the captain of his host; and Abraham himself was rich in gold and silver, in tents, in flocks, and in herds.

If such was the condition of things in Egypt, and other countries at a comparatively great distance from the original seat of population, is it not extremely improbable that, in the plain of Shinar, and on the borders of the Euphrates and Tigris, no kingdom should have been formed, no cities built, and no courts established? There can be no doubt that Moses, in giving the history of Nimrod, meant to convey to his readers such knowledge as had reached his times, respecting the first institution of political authority and of regular government among the descendants of Noah. The beginning of regal power was at Babel: and the grandson of Ham is represented as the first sovereign who aspired to the prerogatives of an autocrat. Babylonia, besides, was known to the latest period of the Jewish state as *the land of Nimrod*; and it is, moreover, the general belief that the persons, who emigrated thence into Assyria, fled away from the face of a tyrant, and from the pressure of a threatened despotism which they could not otherwise avoid.

But, again, this same Nimrod, according to the author of the *Origines*, was a native of Egypt, the son of Neptune and Libya. He is said to have conducted a colony from that kingdom to Babylon, where he instituted an order of Priests called Chaldæans, who, like the priests of Egypt, were exempted from all tribute and service, and who, like them, were employed in the study of physic and astronomy. In this particular the son of Cush is identified with the Egyptian Belus, who, as we are informed by Diodorus Siculus, conducted a body of emigrants towards the East, and established a sort of college in the neighbourhood of the Euphrates: while the celebrated Danaus, his son or brother, was employed in increasing, by similar means, the inhabitants of Argos, one of the most ancient cities of Greece.

The only authority adduced for this singular commentary on the Mosaical narrative, is the circumstance mentioned, indeed, by several ancient historians, that Ninus, the first king of Assyria, was the son of a certain chief called Belus: and, as Sir William had previously established to his own satisfaction that Ninus was the son of Nimrod, it follows that the Egyptian Belus and Nimrod, the grandson of Ham, must have been the same person. But no one knows better than this learned author that as Belus, signifying lord or master, was a general title, it was applied to a

great number of individuals upon earth, and even to the solar orb in heaven. It became, in some form or other, the common appellation of every distinguished sovereign, and was also very frequently introduced into the names of those more obscure princes who had no other claims to notice than that they were descended from a royal lineage. Hence, it must be evident that Sir William Drummond is chargeable with undue haste in the inference which he draws from the use of a very common word ; and, consequently, that there is no reason whatever for believing that Belus the Egyptian, who lived in the era of the Grecian commonwealths, was Nimrod the mighty hunter, the great grandson of Noah, and founder of the Babylonian monarchy.

We next find that this hero of antiquity, the giant, the robber, the tyrant, the apostate, was, according to our Author, king of Shinar in the days of Abraham, and, consequently, one of the three vassal sovereigns under Chedorlaomer, who were defeated by that patriarch. His words are :

“ as we know that Belus or Nimrod was king of Shinar, it seems evident, I think, that he was one of the kings defeated by Abraham, and that the orientlists are right in considering this prince as the contemporary of the patriarch.”

Such an opinion, it appears to us, carries its own refutation along with it. Be it remembered, in the first place, that the Orientalists did not consider Abraham as the contemporary of Nimrod ; they only considered *Ninus* and Abraham as contemporaries ; and it is solely because Sir William has chosen to maintain that Ninus was the son of Nimrod, that he finds it necessary to bring down this son of Cush 700 years later than his proper time. In the second place, there is not in ancient history, whether sacred or profane, the slightest evidence that Nimrod held his kingdom as a vassal of the Iranian monarch. Nor can we trace the most distant affinity between Amraphel, the chief of a small tribe on the borders of Arabia, and the formidable warrior, the beginning of whose power was at Babel, and who has left the greatness and terror of his name among all the nations of the East. In a word, this is one of the grossest perplexities in which Sir William has involved his system, by identifying Nimrod with Belus the father of Ninus.

As soon as an author departs from the straight line of historical truth, he finds himself surrounded with darkness and inconsistency. For example, the whole current of ancient testimony runs in favour of the opinion that Ninus conquered Babylonia and subjected it, as well as the adjacent provinces, to the Assyrian throne. There is scarcely a single writer of antiquity who does not concur in this statement. But Sir William Drummond,

who sees in Ninus only the son and natural successor of Nimrod, is forced to pronounce the conquest of Babylonia, by the Assyrian arms, a groundless fiction.

"We have seen," says he, "from the testimony of various authors, that Ninus was the son of Belus or Nimrod. The account, consequently, which is given by Diodorus Siculus, of the conquest of Babylon by Ninus, is utterly improbable, since the son, it is natural to suppose, would succeed to the dominions of the father. It is to Belus himself that we ought to ascribe this conquest: and there may be reason to think that the same prince obtained possession of the whole territory of Shinar, on agreeing to become a vassal to the Persian monarch" !!

Another glaring inconsistency between the system of the *Origines* and that of the inspired volume appears in a concession which the author of the former finds himself compelled to make; namely, that several dynasties may have governed at Babylon before the grandson of Ham was born.

"Africanus may be right," says he, "(for I adopt with him the chronology of the Seventy,) in asserting that two different dynasties had reigned over Chaldæa before the time of Ninus; but he is manifestly wrong in representing the first of these two dynasties as descended from Nimrod."

We have merely to ask, in reference to the opinion just stated, where is the authority to be found upon which any rational being can be expected to believe that two dynasties, including thirteen kings, could have ruled at Babylon before the days of Nimrod?

It does not, we think, admit of any reasonable controversy, that Babylon was the seat of a royal government many years before the establishment of the Assyrian empire under Ninus. We are not, indeed, thence to infer, that the prince now named was the first monarch of Assyria, or that the country which was planted by Asshur had not, in the course of several centuries, attained to a considerable degree of power. But it seems, notwithstanding, to be perfectly clear, that until Ninus extended his victorious arms into Babylonia, no paramount dominion was acknowledged in those extensive plains which are watered by the Euphrates and the Tigris. Down to that period, the land of Asshur and the land of Nimrod, it is very probable, presented each a small kingdom, consisting of several tribes or families; the heads of which had not yet resigned, into the hand of the general sovereign, the privileges of independent chiefs, and especially the right of making peace or war, whenever their particular interest might appear to be affected.

But it would be vain to conjecture what was the actual situation of the community which was governed by the successors of Asshur at Nineveh, during the period that the first Babylonian kingdom subsisted; or even to attempt to discover the reasons



why it did not sooner emerge from that obscurity which covers the origin of nations. Nor, though it would be easy to prove, that between Nimrod and Ninus there was an interval of several centuries, and also that a number of kings reigned at Babylon before the Assyrian colonists obtained that ascendancy which has raised their name to the highest place in the annals of ancient Asia, do we not take upon us to determine the exact extent of that interval, or the precise amount of the royal successions which filled it up. Some chronographers, on the authority of Africanus, Pölyhistor, and Abydenus, have laboured to establish the existence of three dynasties at Babylon before the conquests of Ninus; while others, with Sir William Drummond, exercising a whimsical scepticism in regard to this part of ancient history, have pronounced the whole doubtful, and the last in particular, namely, the dynasty of the Cuthite Belus, to be nothing better than an idle tale.

Mr. Faber, in his laborious work on the Origin of Pagan Idolatry, acknowledges that six kings succeeded Nimrod, not at Babylon, but at Nineveh, before the commencement of the proper Assyrian empire; or at least, before the accession of the first of those sovereigns who compose the dynasty given by Ctesias, and which extends from Ninus to Thonas Concoleros. As to the Arabs, again, or second dynasty, he mentions that they effected no more than a temporary conquest of Chaldea alone; and that though they continued to occupy the country which they had overrun with their arms, during the long space of 215 years, yet, he maintains that, as the Assyrian empire had begun long before at Nineveh, under the auspices of Nimrod, the Arabian dynasty did not *succeed* the first kings, as Africanus and Polyhistor have recorded, but merely governed some conquered provinces at a distance from the capital. The dynasty of these seven princes, of course, preceded immediately the dynasty of the thirty-six Ninevite sovereigns who are mentioned by Ctesias. Those seven earliest kings, he adds, must have been Nimrod and his lineal descendants; while the thirty-six who compose the Ctesian catalogue, must either have sprung from a younger branch of the house of Nimrod, or must have been members of another Cuthite family, which ascended the throne upon the extinction or abdication of the royal house of the founder.

We have here introduced the opinions of Mr. Faber, because, in one respect, they approach to a coincidence with those of Sir William Drummond. Both these authors maintain that Nineveh was founded by Nimrod, and not by Asshur, or any prince of the Shemitic stem; and also that the first rulers of Assyria were descendants of the mighty hunter. But the rector of Long Newton

never allowed himself to imagine that Ninus was the son and immediate successor of Nimrod; and far less could he believe that these two personages were the contemporaries of Abraham. On the contrary, he divides the times of Nimrod and of the patriarch, by an interval of several hundred years.

Nothing, in fact, which rests upon the mere testimony of ancient history, can be plainer than that there were sovereigns at Babylon before it was reduced by the celebrated Ninus, whose name stands at the head of the Assyrian dynasty preserved by Ctesias. That this ambitious prince was indebted for the possession of Babylon to his victorious arms, and not to hereditary right, is distinctly stated by Diodorus Siculus: and as he was aided in his conquests by the king of the Arabians, there is the best ground for concluding that the second dynasty, described by Africanus, had already given place to a more powerful body of invaders; in other words, that the third dynasty, mentioned by Abydenus, Muribas, and Moses of Chorene, had expelled the second or Arabian, and taken their place. The Sicilian historian relates, that “Ninus, the king of the Assyrians, having called to his assistance the ruler of the Arabs, attacked, with a numerous army, those Babylonians who were nearest to his own territories. But, he adds, the Babylon which now is was not then founded. The country, however, contained several other cities of some consequence, whose inhabitants, unused to war and ignorant of the means of defence, were easily brought into subjection. Ninus having taken captive the king of the vanquished people with his children, forthwith put them to death.”\*

We have already alluded to the opinions of the illustrious Newton on this subject. The great mathematician, not finding in the more ancient books of the Old Testament any mention of the Assyrian monarchy, thought proper to maintain that it did not exist till between seven or eight centuries before the Christian era. Sir John Marsham, indeed, had dated its commencement at a period somewhat more remote: but his arguments were substantially the same with those which were afterwards employed by Sir Isaac, and by all who have adopted the views of the latter. It is manifest, however, that a conclusion, founded upon the mere silence of the Jewish Scriptures, which do not profess to give the history of any other nation, cannot be deemed satisfactory. As a proof of this, let it be noted that Egypt, a country with which the children of Israel were better acquainted than they could be at that time with any eastward of the Euphrates, is not once named

11. \*Ο δ' οὖν τῶν Ἀσσυρίων βασιλεὺς Νίνος τὸν δυναστεύοντα Ἀραβῶν παρακαλῶν ἑστράτευσε μετὰ πολλῆς δυνάμεως ἐπὶ Βαβυλωνίους. κ. τ. λ.—*Diod. Sicul. lib. ii. c. 32.*

or alluded to, in the books of Judges and of Samuel, though these contain the annals of the Hebrew people during five hundred years. Would it not be unreasonable to pronounce that, because the land of the Pharaohs is not mentioned by the Israelitish chroniclers for more than five centuries, it had no existence during that long interval? The Grecian kingdoms and republics too, had in the meanwhile established their foundations, and even begun to awaken an interest along the western shores of Asia: but of these celebrated communities no trace is to be discovered in the earlier part of the sacred volume. The monarchies of India and of China are equally unnoticed in the Hebrew annals; but we are not thence to infer that no government was formed in the great eastern continent, until after the canon of Scripture was completed, or that civil society had made no progress in Europe before the captivity of Israel and Judah. The mere silence of the sacred page, therefore, is not to be held conclusive against the existence of the ancient Assyrian empire; and more especially when we are assured by a Pagan author, that during the very period to which our attention is now directed, the sovereigns of that country pursued a pacific policy, and sought not either to distinguish their reigns, or to extend their borders, by means of warlike expeditions.

Sir William Jones acknowledges that the omission in Scripture, of all notice relative to the Assyrian empire, till more than two centuries after the reign of David, had induced him to adopt the opinion of Newton, as to the recent origin of that powerful kingdom. But he informs us, that "it seemed unaccountably strange, that although Abraham had formed a regular monarchy in Egypt; although the kingdom of Yemen had just pretensions to a very high antiquity; although the Chinese, in the twelfth century before our era, had made approaches at least to the present form of their extensive dominion, and although we can hardly suppose the first Indian monarchs to have reigned less than three thousand years ago, yet Persia, the most delightful, the most compact, the most desirable country of them all, should have remained for so many ages unsettled and disunited."

As far as this argument is concerned, Assyria and Persia may be assumed as convertible terms; and the conclusion held by Sir William Jones, in regard to the latter, applies with at least equal cogency to the former. If, in the days of Abraham, there was a regular government in Egypt and in Palestine, there can be no doubt that society had already taken a similar form in the lands of Asshur and of Nimrod; on which account, we have no difficulty in rejecting the abbreviated scheme of Newton, and in



adopting the more extended computation of Hales, Faber, and Sir William Drummond.

The last of these authors, after examining the testimony of Diodorus, Justin, and Velleius Paterculus, expresses his conviction that, between Ninus and Sardanapalus, there ruled at Nineveh thirty-three sovereigns, whose joint reigns amounted to 1,104 years. But as, according to the chronographer, the Assyrian empire was founded by Belus, or Nimrod, the father of Ninus, who is said to have governed 72 years, the whole term of its duration will not be less than 1,176 years. Again, the same author reminds us that Nineveh was taken by the Medes under Arbaces 747 years before the Christian era; whence it follows, according to his calculation, that the Assyrian monarchy originated 1,923 years before the birth of our Saviour.

Now, if we take this result in connection with the vulgar chronology of the Hebrew Scriptures, the commencement of the reign of Belus will coincide with the year 425 after the flood; a period, we admit, which agrees very well with our notions respecting the beginnings of civil government among the descendants of Noah. But Sir William, rejecting the chronological method pursued by Usher and Lloyd, to whom the English reader owes the system of dates which is placed in the margin of the Bible, adopts the computation of the Septuagint; and hence, the reign of Belus or Nimrod must be understood to fall in the beginning of the thirtieth century after the flood. The accession of Ninus, being 72 years later, will come down towards the end of the century just specified: and in this way the author of the *Origines* will find himself involved in two difficulties; being called upon to explain, first, how the son of Cush could ascend the throne of Assyria twelve hundred years after the deluge, and next, how he and Ninus could be contemporary with Abraham, who, according to this hypothesis, must have been dead a century before the latter of these princes was born.

All this confusion arises from a determination on the part of Sir William, not to regard Nimrod as literally the grandson of Ham, but rather as a remote descendant of that patriarch; and hence it is that he places him in the days of Abraham, who, according to the very chronology which the baronet himself approves, did not live until five hundred years after the time when the mighty hunter planted his kingdom at Babel. The following paragraph will prove that we have given the true sense of the author:

“The departure of Abraham from Ur probably took place early in the reign of Belus; and we may accordingly suppose this monarch to have mounted the throne in the year 1923 before Christ. Augustin and

Jerom fix the duration of his reign at 65 years. Consequently Ninus, his son, did not begin to reign until the year 1858 before our era. I find, however, that according to Polyhistor, Euechios, as he calls Nimrod, reigned during four *Neroi*; but this is evidently an error for four *Saroi*, which would give 72 years for the reign of this monarch. In this case we must reckon the first year of Ninus for the year 1851 before Christ; and the authority of Polyhistor, upon this point, is preferable to that of the two fathers. But Nineveh was taken by the Medes under Arbaces, 747 years before the Christian era. Consequently 1,104 years elapsed from the commencement of the reign of Ninus to the dissolution of the Assyrian empire under Sardanapalus. If then we reckon 33 reigns after Belus, this calculation will give us at an average 33 years, and nearly six months, for each reign."—*Origines*, vol. i. p. 282.

The absurd consequences to which the hypothesis of this learned antiquary carries his readers, supply of themselves a sufficient ground of refutation. But, we must add, he has not even followed the usual path of historical testimony, relative to the number of reigns and the gross amount of their duration. According to Africanus and Syncellus, the list of sovereigns amounted to 36, and the term, from Ninus to Sardanapalus, to not less than 1,300 years. If then to 1,300 years, we add 747, the sum will be 2,047 years before Christ, for the date of Ninus's accession; and as Abraham, agreeably to the notation of the Septuagint, was born 1,070 years after the flood, or about 48 years before Ninus became the monarch of Assyria, it is manifest that they must have been contemporaries.

This result corresponds with a tradition which prevailed universally in the ancient world, that Ninus and the patriarch lived in the same age; and as it rests upon a computation which combines all the elements of historical knowledge which have reached our times, we may safely conclude that it is not far distant from the truth; the intelligent reader must, accordingly, have perceived that the radical error in the system of Sir Wm. Drummond is the identification of Nimrod with Belus the father of Ninus; for, proceeding upon this assumption, he finds it necessary to date the birth of the first of these personages several centuries too late, but still not late enough to coincide with the era of the great ancestor of the Hebrew people. In a word, Ninus is brought too far down, either to occupy the place in ancient history which is usually assigned to him, or to allow sufficient time between his accession and the capture of Nineveh, for the term at which the duration of the Assyrian empire is most commonly computed.

The author of the *Origines* has, however, avoided the groundless innovations of Dr. Gillies and of Dr. Hales, who fix the beginning of the proper Assyrian empire, about twelve centuries

before the birth of Christ: the latter of these chronologists, indeed, allows that a kingdom was formed at Nineveh about a thousand years sooner; but maintains, that its power passed away into the hands of the Persians, or of some other rival nation, and that during the long period now mentioned, no sovereign sat upon the throne of Ninus. After this interregnum of nearly two centuries, a new dynasty arose in the person of Ninus the second; who proved, we are told, an ambitious and successful warrior, and is supposed to have in reality performed many of the exploits which are ascribed by the oldest Greek writers, to his celebrated namesake, the husband of Semiramis. Dr. Gillies, on the other hand, does not condescend to admit that the Assyrian empire had assumed any form whatever, before the middle of the thirteenth century preceding the era of our faith. Combining the notions of Marsham and of Newton, reposing his chief confidence in the accuracy of Herodotus, he denies that there is any evidence in ancient history, whether sacred or profane, for the existence of the monarchy of Assyria at an earlier period than that which is indicated by the Grecian author just named.

We repeat that there is no authority whatever for the opinion now stated, except the observation already quoted from Herodotus, relative to the length of time that the Assyrians held the government of Upper Asia. Appian, no doubt, as well as Dionysius of Halicarnassus, have adopted the views, or repeated the words of that celebrated writer; but with this exception, we know not of any testimony on which to rest the conclusions of those authors, who place the beginning of the Assyrian monarchy at 1230 years before the epoch of redemption.

It is worthy of remark that, at the period indicated by this calculation, the judges bore rule over the children of Israel: and it is well known that the Assyrian power was not heard of in Judea, for several centuries afterwards. Thus, the very reasons which induced Newton to believe that there could have been no empire at Nineveh, until the days of Pul, apply with equal force to the times of the Hebrew Judges, and even of the first three kings of Israel: for in the Bible no mention is made of that power, until about 200 years after the reign of Solomon. There is no record applicable to the middle of the thirteenth century before Christ, which can in any respect authorize a chronologer to confer upon it the distinction of having given birth, or even a revival, to the kingdom of Ninus.

Now, upon a full review of all the circumstances attending the two cases, it appears less improbable that an ambitious prince should have overrun the central parts of Asia, twenty centuries



before the reign of Augustus, and finally employed his warriors in the erection of a city on the banks of the Tigris, than that a similar character, a thousand years afterwards, should have subdued the finest regions and most powerful nations of the world, and yet leave among his contemporaries no impression by which his progress might be traced. We shall inquire by and by into the soundness of the opinions entertained by Dr. Gillies respecting the situation of Nineveh, as well as in regard to the question whether there ever were in Assyria two cities which bore that name; meanwhile it may be asserted that the general current of history, not less than the actual condition of society in Syria and Mesopotamia, at the time when the kingly government commenced among the Hebrews, oppose an insuperable obstacle to our belief that the Assyrian empire could either have originated or received any considerable increase at so late a period. Syncellus relates, that, in the time of Abraham, Ninus and Semiramis ruled over the whole of Asia: an exaggerated expression, no doubt, but which at least sufficiently marks the date of Assyrian power, according to the computation of the ancient chronologers. Cusantane Manasses has in like manner recorded in his annals, that Belus, the father of Ninus, was contemporary with the same patriarch, and was after his death respected and worshipped as a God, under the name of Chronus or Saturn. The authority of Plato also has been adduced in support of the same views. In the third book of his laws he asserts, that the people of Assyria governed a great part of Asia several ages before the Trojan war. A remark which at least makes known the tradition which prevailed on that subject in the learned world, four centuries prior to the Christian era.

We may, therefore, conclude that if there are difficulties in the chronological system, which assumes the greater antiquity of the Assyrian empire, there are not fewer in the hypothesis which leads us to seek its origin only 1230 years before the revelation of Christianity. If it appears unreasonable to suppose that the power of such a kingdom should, during so many centuries, have been confined on the west by the Syrian desert, there is certainly not less improbability in the opinion that, in the full tide of its youth and vigour, it should have restricted itself four or five hundred years to the same limits, and not even have attempted to extend its borders towards Egypt and the Mediterranean sea. In a word, the inactivity of the Assyrian kings, from the thirteenth to the eighth century before Christ, is more consistent with the supposed antiquity of their race, and with the soft and effeminate manners by which they were distinguished, than with the notion of a con-

quering dynasty, which had just started up to grasp the sceptre of Asia, and to reduce to the condition of vassals all tribes of the east, as well as of the west.

These remarks, we need not repeat, do not apply directly to the hypothesis of Sir William Drummond. He adopts, partially, the computation of the more ancient writers, who assign to the duration of the Assyrian power much wider limits; but, not having confidence in Julius Africanus and Syncellus, he does not go sufficiently far back, and hence his conclusion does not harmonize with the facts with which he has thought proper to connect it. In a word, there is not, between the scheme of Newton and that of the old chronographers, any middle position which can be occupied with certainty; and it is in the attempt to create such a point, that our author has missed the complete success which must otherwise have attended his labours.

Not finding it convenient, at present, to follow his steps through the intricacies of Egyptian chronology, we shall devote the remainder of this article to a review of his opinions on the site of ancient Nineveh.

That this great city did not stand on the eastern bank of the Tigris, opposite to Mosul, but that it occupied the space between the Tigris and the Zab, or Lycus, is, he thinks, rendered manifest by the following considerations.

“The plain which lies on the eastern side of the Tigris, directly opposite to Mosul, is, by the admission of Major Rennell, only five miles in breadth. This could not, therefore, have been the site of Nineveh, if Diodorus be correct in stating the width of that city at ninety stadia.

—“It appears clear from the sacred writings, that Nineveh was surrounded with rivers. ‘The gates of the rivers shall be opened.—Nineveh is of old like a pool of water.—Draw thee waters for the siege.—I will make Nineveh a desolation, dry like a desert.—Art thou better than No Amon, that was situate among the the rivers?’ These citations, and especially the last, says Sir William, could scarcely have been applicable to Nineveh, if that city had been opposite to Mosul; but they become perfectly appropriate, if the Assyrian capital were situated immediately above the confluence of the Tigris and the Lycus.

“According to Diodorus Siculus, there were mountains at the distance of 70 stadia from Nineveh, and plains intervened between these mountains and the city. But how shall we call the country between Mosul and the mountains on the opposite side of the river, a plain country, when Mr. Howel compares the appearance of it to that which is presented to the inhabitants of London by the high grounds of Highgate and Hampstead? Niebuhr tells us distinctly, that the pretended ramparts of Nineveh were really natural hills. But even if this were a plain country, it is only four miles broad. Now, according to Diodorus, the city, at least in one part of it, was more than seven miles broad; and the

plains beyond it, and between it and the mountains, extended near six miles. If Diodorus be right, Nineveh could not be situated where the inhabitants of Mosul represented it to have been placed.

"If we believe Diodorus, the Medes only obtained possession of Nineveh because the river had thrown down the wall to an extent of twenty stadia. It was an ancient tradition, says the same historian, that Nineveh could not be taken unless the river first became hostile to the city. Now from the representation which Niebuhr gives of Kalla Nunia, it seems difficult to imagine how the Tigris could have risen, at that place, so high above its eastern bank as to have thrown down walls of the strength which we must attribute to those of Nineveh. If, however, we suppose this city to have been situated near the confluence of the Tigris and the Lycus, we can more easily understand, how such an effect might have been produced, because when these two rivers are in flood, their waters will of course inundate the low parts of the country which lie between them. It appears that all the grounds on the west side of the Lycus, and contiguous to that river, are flat, and consequently are liable to be inundated. Thus we can easily understand how the walls of Nineveh, even to the extent of 20 stadia, may have been thrown down by the Lycus, before its struggling waters, swollen to unusual magnitude, perhaps by the melting of the snow, could force their way into the channel of the Tigris, when that stream might be equally raised above its usual level.

"I have already observed, that the ground where I suppose Nineveh to have stood, was low and flat in some parts, and especially on the side next the Lycus, while it was hilly and uneven in others. The walls of the city were washed by the Tigris on the west side, and by the Lycus on the east side. Two smaller streams must have flowed through the middle of the city, if we can trust to the accounts of travellers, or indeed to Rennell's map, though he has diverted one of these torrents into the Tigris, where a mountain, or at least some very high ground, seems to oppose its passage. Thus, according to the words of the sacred writer, Nineveh, like Amon-No, 'was situate among the rivers,' and 'had the waters round about it.' If we suppose Nineveh to have stood opposite to Mosul, we shall in vain attempt to explain the language of the prophet."

We have given the argument of Sir William at considerable length, and without leaving out any part which could materially strengthen his hypothesis. The objections to his conclusion are as follows :

1. There are no traces of such a city as Nineveh to be discovered in the tract of ground between the Tigris and the Zab, where our author supposes the capital of Assyria to have stood. Perishable as were the materials of which the cities of that alluvial territory were composed, we cannot believe that such a mass of building as Nineveh could have so entirely disappeared as to leave not a single tower or mound behind, to enable the traveller to



mark its boundaries, or collect some evidence of its ancient grandeur. Of Babylon itself, the destruction of which was not less complete than that of the older Assyrian capital, there are still some tokens remaining, whence we can determine the locality which it occupied, and even the extent of its more prominent buildings; but at the confluence of the Tigris and its tributary stream, the Lycus or Zab, there is neither wall, nor pillar, nor statute, nor inscription, to identify the dwelling of the powerful descendants of Ninus.

Now, on the supposed site of Nineveh, opposite to Mosul, there are even at the present day many unequivocal indications of a great city having spread its streets and palaces over the adjacent country. Mr. Rich, who inspected the ruins of Kalla Nunia, relates in his valuable Memoir on Babylon, several particulars which remove all doubt as to the fact that there must have existed on that spot a very large town, with the usual accompaniment of fortifications and public edifices. Alluding to the monument of Ninus, which is described as having been of a very durable form, he assures us "that the remains of it are still to be seen among traces which yet exist of the ancient Nineveh. He observed an inclosure of a rectangular shape, surrounded with an embankment of earth, having on it, at certain distances, mounds or towers of considerable size and solidity. The area, he remarks, is too small to have contained a town larger than Mosul, but it may be supposed to answer to the palace of Nineveh. The first of the mounds forms the south-west angle; and on it is built the village of Nebbi Yunus, where they show the tomb of the prophet Jonas, much revered by the Mahometans. The next, and largest of all, is the one which may be supposed to be the monument of Ninus. The form is that of a truncated pyramid, with regular steep sides and a flat top; it is composed, as I ascertained from some excavations, of stones and earth, the latter predominating sufficiently to admit of the summit being cultivated by the inhabitants of the village of Koyunjuk, which is built upon it at the northern extremity. The only means I had, at the time I visited it, of ascertaining its dimensions, was by a cord which I procured from Mosul. This gave 178 feet for the greatest height, 1,850 feet the length of the summit east and west, and 1,147 for its breadth, north and south. The other mounds, on the boundary wall, offer nothing worthy of remark. Out of one on the north side was dug, a short time ago, an immense block of stone, on which were sculptured the figures of men and animals. So remarkable was this fragment of antiquity, that even Turkish apathy was roused, and the Pasha and most of the principal people of Mosul went

out to see it. One of the spectators particularly recollected, among the sculptures of this stone, the figure of a man on horse-back, with a long lance in his hand, followed by a great many others on foot. Cylinders, like those of Babylon, and other antiques, are occasionally found here, but I have never seen or heard of inscriptions. It is very likely that a considerable part of Mosul, at least of the public works, was constructed with the materials found at Nineveh. Koyunjuk Tepè has been dug into in some places in search of them; and to this day, stones of very large dimensions, which sufficiently attest their high antiquity, were found at the foot of the mound which forms the boundary."—*Second Memoir on Babylon*, p. 39.

These facts are deserving of no small degree of attention; and in the absence of all similar evidence for the existence of such a city elsewhere, they tend greatly to confirm the tradition which prevails in the eastern world, that Nineveh stood opposite to the modern Mosul.

2. Sir William Drummond himself admits, that the authority of oriental writers, such as Edrissi, Benjamin Judæus, and Haico the Armenian, is decidedly hostile to his conclusions. He attempts to diminish the weight of their opinions by reminding us that they are not agreed among themselves, as to the precise site of Nineveh; but he admits, at the same time, that their legends imposed so much on the cruel and victorious Timur Lang, that after having sacked the city, he built a magnificent mosque over the reputed tomb of the prophet Jonah. Could Sir William quote as much historical testimony in support of his opinion, that Nineveh was built near the junction of the Zab and the Tigris; or could he show that any public act was ever performed with a reference to that belief; or that travellers went thither in search of antiquities, and found the remains of monuments, and sculptured stones, and extensive embankments, we should be more willing to allow that his reasonings were conclusive, and his hypothesis well founded.

3. The same remarks may be made in regard to tradition, which has all along pointed to the spot where Kulla Nunia now stands, as being the site of ancient Nineveh. Sir William, indeed, asserts that

“the time is past, when conjecture, appealing to legendary tales, could give the lie to probability; and when fiction, wearing the veil of antiquity, could escape the detection of criticism. Credulity, he adds, has been taught some useful lessons on the plain of Troy, where travellers, deceived by local traditions, long mistook the ruins of Alexandria Troas for those of ancient Ilium. Perhaps the day is not distant, he concludes,

when antiquarians will acknowledge that they have been as much in error about the site of the city of Ninus, as they once were about that of the Pergamus of Homer."—*Origines*, i. 203.

We agree with the author generally, as to the caution with which the voice of tradition should be heard and interpreted, whether speaking to us through the medium of poetry, or through that of historical narrative. But tradition has always some basis in truth; on which account we are disposed to ascribe to the hereditary belief of the Asiatics, respecting Nineveh, a degree of importance which prevents us, at least, from adopting the hypothesis which is now recommended to us with so much zeal and learning.

The reader who takes any interest in such inquiries, may not be displeased to be reminded that Dr. Gillies, the historian of Greece, places Nineveh in the Babylonian plain, between the Euphrates and the Tigris. But as his great city has likewise "totally disappeared," and left neither ruin, nor record, nor tradition behind, it must be ranked with those aerial creations which ingenious men have so frequently produced in the absence of fact and testimony.

We find nothing new in the tract inserted in the third volume of this work, "On the Origin of the Phenicians." It contains, no doubt, the usual share of learning, criticism, and hypothesis, which distinguish all the labours of this acute writer; but when we compare it with the essay of Bishop Cumberland, in his *Origines Gentium Antiquissimæ*, we discover that modern research has not succeeded in throwing any additional light over the obscurity of Sidonian genealogies.

Our opinion of Sir William Drummond's book is now fully before the public; and every competent judge, we think, will allow that we have bestowed upon his literary and antiquarian investigations, the attention to which, from their nature and objects, they may appear to have a just claim. It has given us pleasure to praise his industry and erudition; and respecting those points wherein his opinions were different from ours, we have always submitted our judgment with the feeling of diffidence which cannot but be suitable to a course of inquiry where the most learned men have arrived at opposite conclusions, and never without adducing the reasons and stating the evidence upon which our peculiar views are founded.

---



ART. X.—1. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Stow, at the Visitation in May, 1826.* By Henry Vincent Bayley, D. D. Archdeacon of Stow. Gainsborough. 1826. 8vo.

2. *The Principle of Ecclesiastical Order explained and enforced: A Sermon preached at a General Ordination in the Cathedral Church of Chester, on Sunday, July 9th, 1826.* By the Rev. James J. Hornby, M. A. Rector of Winwick. London. Rivingtons. 1826. 8vo.

It has been the pleasure of the Archdeacon of Stow, to limit his Charge, as nearly as possible, to a circulation of exact and prescribed diameter. He has not chosen to give it the free course of publication by sale, but to confine its publicity to distribution among friends. Whether his object was to place it beyond the limits of Critical Jurisdiction, we cannot divine. If it was, his purpose has been egregiously defeated. The Charge before us has been so widely circulated beyond the limits of his Archdeaconry, that, although it may have escaped what is *technically* called Publication, it has become much too notorious to claim the privilege of obscurity and privacy. It is “unknown and yet well known.”

We cannot easily imagine what it is that prompted the Archdeacon to this coyness and reserve. Perhaps he may have thought that observations addressed peculiarly to his own limited flock, had no claim on the attention of the Clerical body at large. Perhaps, too, he may have felt conscious of some little deviation from the general style and character of such performances. An Archdeaconal Charge is usually a very sedate and solemn sort of document: full of grave admonition and useful information; often breathing the spirit of mild wisdom and sober piety: but seldom distinguished by the loftier and more spirit-stirring graces of composition. Now here we have in ample measure the customary and more appropriate ingredients; and besides them, much that is rarely to be found in these official Addresses. We find in it elements that powerfully stir the affections, and give a livelier pulse to our hopes, and a keener vivacity to the sense of our duties. Like the Harp of David, it refreshes the Soul, and chases away the Evil Spirit of Dejection, from those, who may be appalled with fear of change and danger to the Church: Like the trumpet of the faithful Watchman,\* it sounds throughout the bulwarks and fortresses of our Zion a warning note, which cries “sleep no more,” to all the guardians of her prosperity and honour.

\* Ezek. xxxiii. 3.

It has long been our wish to submit to the public our views and opinions respecting some departments of Discipline of our Church, more especially with reference to its secondary and inferior officers. And it so happens that the Charge before us presents a detail of duties, which furnishes a fair opportunity for such animadversions as a body of Theological Critics may venture to offer.

The first thing, then, that struck us on perusal of this Charge, was the almost apologetic tone in which the Archdeacon thinks it necessary to speak of the Articles of Inquiry directed by him to the minister and officers of each parish. He takes very laudable pains to satisfy his Clergy that this mode of Inquisition is of high antiquity and authority, founded on the canons of Councils, the decrees of Pontiffs, and the dicta of holy Fathers. He thinks it more especially necessary to guard against the notion—which inexperience might possibly suggest—that he has been guilty of an illiberal innovation, in circulating, among other questions, an inquiry addressed to churchwardens, as to the life, character, and ministrations of the officiating clergyman. He very gravely affirms that, the insertion of this question is in strict conformity with immemorial practice. He further takes occasion very justly to remark, that it can convey no affront to any respectable minister; that no human virtue is strong enough to refuse the aid of subsidiary motives; and that they whose professional feeling is highest, will be just the very last to question “the utility of an inspection so authoritatively enjoined, and of a report so strictly demanded.”

Now to us, we confess, all this sounds very strange! There is something almost ominous in this anxious vindication of regular and traditional practices. It looks very much as if the venerable usages and laws of the Church had, somehow or other, been allowed to fall into partial desuetude and oblivion; as if her “strong statutes” had long stood “like forfeits in a barber’s shop, as much in mock as mark!” It looks as if “the book of Articles” had degenerated into such mere formality, that when an Archdeacon should venture to infuse some life and spirit into the almost dead letter of his Visitation-duties, his activity might, peradventure, excite some little surprize and reaction. In truth, the present race of Archdeacons is much to be commiserated, if their authority has come to them in a condition so dilapidated, as the above conciliatory expressions would seem to imply. If the most antient and unquestionable of their powers cannot be exercised, without the suspicion of making new experiments, it is high time that public opinion should come in, vigorously and decidedly, to their aid. And in order that it may do so, usefully and effectually, it

is important that the public mind should be rightly informed respecting the nature of their office.

We cannot help suspecting that the notions attached to this function have long been very imperfect and erroneous. People seem to have considered it merely as a sort of honorary distinction: as something which gave to the wearer, the title of Venerable; which assigned him precedence over a very large portion of his brethren; and enabled him to stand out, in bolder relief, from the general surface of the profession. But, till of late, it seems scarcely to have entered into many persons' heads, that any material and solid duties were connected with this distinguished rank in the Church; except, indeed, the arduous one of an annual meeting of this officer with the Clergy of his Archdeaconry, the exertation of his own lungs, and of their patience, by the delivery of a certain technical composition, usually known by the name of a Charge; and the final ceremony of adjourning with them from the Church to the Inn, to drink bad wine, and sometimes to hear bad speeches, till the hour of separation and relief should arrive. How such notions of this most ancient and important function should have prevailed so long and so generally, we cannot, very confidently, divine. One can hardly help apprehending, however, that about half a century ago, there must have existed a race of these venerable functionaries, quite alive to the honours and distinctions of their office; but as indifferent and as ill-informed about its powers and responsibilities as a large portion of the public appears to be at this moment: and that from them has descended the *damnosa hereditas* which sometimes appears to defy the energies and resources of the most active of their successors. We hardly know on what other supposition to account for much of what we see and hear. Let any one, for instance, make a circuit of the villages, throughout a considerable portion of these realms, and what is the spectacle which in too many instances will salute his eyes on entering the Churchyard? On looking at the exterior of the Church, he will often find it half buried beneath the mould, which has been suffered to accumulate round it for ages, and to spread a gradual decay throughout the walls and the foundation. On entering it, he will find that every thing answers faithfully to the promise without; and that the external provision for perpetuating dampness and discomfort within, has succeeded to admiration. The walls will appear decorated with hangings of green; a carpeting of the same pattern often partially covers the floor; and the very first and last thoughts which are excited by the whole appearance of the building, are those of ague, catarrh, and rheumatism! Now



it is quite clear that the predominant wish of every one who goes into an edifice in such a condition as this, must be, to get out of it again, as soon as possible! And yet this is the state, we fear, of no inconsiderable proportion of those sacred places, which never should be approached but with hearts responding to the exclamations of the psalmist—"I was glad when they said unto me, let us go into the House of the Lord!" We ask, then, could these things have been so, if Archdeacons had, in all preceding times, felt and acted up to the true spirit of their office? And is it matter of wonder, if even in these days of comparative energy and vigilance, the inveterate evil should be found to contest the ground, inch by inch, against the most unwearied spirit of reform?

Of the nature of the Archdeacon's office we have a very brief and yet very complete exposition in the Charge before us:—

"The Archdeacon, on his part, is as solemnly pledged to the Bishop, to act in his stead, and on his behalf; to be his eye always, and often his hand—to view every corner of his province, and to detect and present unto him offences—to inquire generally of all things spiritual and temporal, appertaining to good order, within his jurisdiction—and to communicate whatever information he may obtain as to the state, conduct, and sufficiency of the Clergy. Further, it is his business, as immediate Ordinary, to visit every Parish Church and Glebe House, and to injoin proper reparations—to look after charitable bequests and endowments, the rights and property of the Fabric and Incumbent—and, lastly, to take care, as far as in him lies, that all the functions of the ministerial calling, all the duties of residence, and all the services of the liturgy, be legally and canonically performed."—*Bayley*, pp. 6, 7.

Now we trust that there is not to be found at this day an ecclesiastic, who could endure the thoughts of abandoning such momentous responsibilities as these. If ever there were persons who could be content to seek this office merely for its rank and dignity, and who could deliberately suffer parish churches and glebe houses to fall into decay for want of regular and effective visitation—we are persuaded that the race exists no longer. Indeed they would hardly be tolerated in an age, which, beyond all others that have gone before it, subjects public men to public inspection and censure. We repeat, therefore, that the mass of evil, which still cries out for a steady application of the Archdeacon's authority, must in a great measure be a legacy bequeathed to us by the ignorance or neglect of past generations. In some cases, indeed, it may be the result of peculiar and local circumstances, beyond the control of the individual; or it may have arisen in part from a defect in the powers belonging to this office, which from long disuse, or from the imperfection of the law, may be less

summary than could be desired. We trust, however, that a spirit is abroad, which shall overcome all difficulties, and shall gradually infuse new life and strength into this most essential department of ecclesiastical discipline.

If indeed, there should be now extant a solitary specimen of this sort of merely passive and representative Archdeacon—one who hath almost forgotten himself to silk and poplin—we should not be advocates for the dangerous process of tasking his energies too suddenly. We would not ask of him to explore the learning and antiquity connected with his interesting office. We would not require him to illustrate and adorn it by affluence of information and patience of research. We would simply refer him to the brief manual of his duties we have cited above. And we should do this in the full confidence that it must gradually awaken him to a sense of the obligations connected with his conspicuous station. A repeated perusal of it at prudent intervals of time would surely, at last, satisfy him of the inestimable benefit that must accrue to the Church from a faithful and vigilant discharge of these duties; and show him the tremendous chasm which must be occasioned by the abandonment or suspension of this department of ecclesiastical discipline.

We cannot, here, forbear to remark generally, that, whether in sacred matters or profane, a dissolution of the bond between high office and faithful service, is still more widely and more deeply calamitous than even the usual estimate of it might lead us to imagine. It is in truth a destructive and two-edged mischief. It not only lays waste the peculiar province of usefulness allotted to the individual; but it tends to spread the curse of sterility and desolation over every surrounding region. And on this account it is that public opinion should look forth upon the evil with an aspect of unsparing jealousy and sternness. When once this falling-sickness has invaded any arduous and extensive province of duty, it sends among the infected members a positive dread and hatred of activity. And if any of the fraternity, so affected, should exhibit unusual symptoms of health and vigour, immediately the eye of his brethren is evil towards him. They seem to regard him as a sort of dangerous *energumen*, haunted and agitated by the turbulent demon of reform. They look on him as an unresting Spirit, that wanders over *dry* places in search of repose, which he cannot find. And thus it is that the zeal and integrity of faithful men is too often stamped almost with the mark of insanity: till, under the withering influence of constant discouragement, there is an almost utter extinction and loss of that restorative and self-corrective power, which is necessary to preserve all institutions from decay.

We offer these remarks, however, purely in the spirit of precaution. We trust that their direct and pointed application is reserved for days indefinitely remote. We are supported and encouraged in this hope by our recent recollection of such men as Wollaston, and Sandford, and Jefferson; and by the living examples of a Goddard, a Bonney, and a Butler;\* with other distinguished names, whose memorial will be blessed, and whose deeds will follow them. And we discern ample cause for thankfulness and encouragement in the general and "glad acclaim" with which the Charge before us has been received, almost throughout the clerical profession.

We are the less able to endure any reduction of efficacy in the office of Archdeacon, in the present age, because the Church has long been suffering from the partial extinction of another very ancient and useful function, that of the Rural Dean. This loss is bitterly lamented by the author, in common with every intelligent friend and guardian of the Establishment; and we trust that the complaint will be iterated and echoed till it has accomplished the general restoration of this office. It is possible, indeed, that even this sober and salutary reform may meet with cold looks from the few remaining patrons of quiet and comfortable degeneracy. But it is satisfactory to reflect, that such persons will find themselves destitute of their usual topics of ill-boding declamation. If they venture to speak of the difficulty of such revival, we have only to reply that in some dioceses, (as Exeter, St. David's, &c.) the office of Rural Dean still flourishes; that in most parts of Ireland it is in full vigour; that at Llandaff and Peterborough it has been re-established, with complete success by Bishop Marsh. The birds of darkness and evil omen, therefore, will blink and croak in vain, while the Church is renewing her strength like the eagle, and soaring upwards towards the source of light and life.

In p. 16, &c. we have a very strong and animated protest against the practice of administering Baptism in private houses. The Archdeacon complains that "the Sacrament which dedicates the child to his Redeemer, and pledges him to the Christian service, in the sight and amidst the prayers of the congregation, is perpetually thrust out of the temple, into the privacy of a chamber or a drawing-room." And he adds, that "the minister has *no right* thus to degrade a blessed ordinance into a beggarly ceremonial; to sink that sacred office, by which our infant names are enrolled in the Book of Life, into a business of parchment and

\* Dr. Butler is Archdeacon of Derby, and Master of Shrewsbury School. His labours and his attainments have raised the school to the highest reputation; and his vacations (we are informed) are chiefly devoted to Parochial Visitations! Such conduct is above all praise. A single example like this is enough to banish despair.



parochial registration." He expresses his conviction, that no cause has been more perniciously effective in separating our people from us, or in "obliterating the feeling of Churchmanship among us." He condemns the notion, that the evil is too inveterate for cure; and, speaking experimentally, he feels assured that perseverance, kindness, and discretion, will gradually and certainly prevail against it.

This very reprehensible abuse of a most awful solemnity has, of late, been so strongly discountenanced in some distinguished quarters, that we are willing to hope that the original and canonical practice will, in the course of time, be at least partially restored;—we say partially, because even the public administration of baptism, according to the almost universal practice of the present day, is by no means conformed to the directions of the rubric. Those directions seem clearly to require that the baptismal service shall immediately follow the last lesson, either at morning or evening prayer, "as the Curate by his discretion shall appoint." And if this injunction were observed, the infant would, truly, be dedicated to his Redeemer *in the sight, and amid the prayers, of the congregation*. But it is now the general and notorious custom to postpone the Christenings till the afternoon prayer is over; and in that case *the congregation*, which is to witness the solemnity, is no better than a mere fiction, none being ever present at it but the minister, the clerk, and the parties, and sometimes a few stragglers. It is needless to dwell upon the various obstacles which, at this day, present themselves to a complete conformity with the rubric in this particular; especially in London and other very populous places. They are so formidable, that we can hardly see our way to the most hopeful method of subduing them. We cannot, however, but think that the occasional and frequent restoration of this service to its proper place would be cheaply purchased even by the sacrifice of the afternoon lecture; for we fully agree with the Archdeacon, that it is "of singular beauty and interest; and that, for the omission of it, no sermon can atone."—p. 17.

In the country, at least, the reform is surely practicable; and if it cannot be complete in large and populous parishes, it may still be an important step towards it if this blessed rite can be protected from desecration, and the administration of it strictly confined to the Church. Except in cases of absolute necessity, it ought, unquestionably, to take place within consecrated walls: it ought, moreover, to have the fullest character of publicity,—it should be performed on a spot accessible to all; if there be none assembled to witness it, there should, at least, be nothing to prevent or discourage their assembling; the open door of the

Church, on holydays as well as on the Sabbath, should seem to invite all, who may choose, to be present at the reception of a new member into the "congregation of Christ's flock."

The disuse of Catechizing is another subject of deep regret with the Archdeacon; and he asks how this comes to pass? whether from the fastidious impatience of the congregation, or from the haste of the minister, or from a low estimate of its value, or from a notion that its necessity is superseded? It is probable that all these causes may, in various degrees and proportions, have combined to produce this disastrous effect; but no one we think, in this part of the world, can hesitate to ascribe, chiefly, to the "impatience of the congregation" the discontinuance of this practice in the midst of the service. The prayers, the psalmody and the sermon together, occupy a very considerable time; and people are not very willing to have these services interrupted and protracted by the parenthetical performance of an office which, however momentous in itself, many will find intolerably wearisome on perpetual repetition. "The chair of the catechist of old," the Archdeacon observes, "was filled (occasionally) by the highest authorities, the finest talents, and the deepest learning:" and at this day, where catechetical instruction is administered by persons signally qualified for it by familiarity with the Scripture and knowledge of the human heart, it must be highly interesting. But it would be vain to hope for a general supply and constant succession of ministers thus eminently gifted: catechizing, therefore, in the congregations of the metropolis, though it can never cease to be in the highest degree useful and important, is never likely to be generally attractive, otherwise than as an exercise of rare and periodical occurrence. At the same time, we can imagine that, in the smaller and less refined audiences of a country Church, a small portion of the catechism, accurately and intelligently repeated, and followed by an explanatory sermon, may often be as interesting as it must be beneficial.

These considerations, however, can furnish no excuse whatever for the utter neglect of the canonical injunction, that the Vicar or Curate on every Sunday or holyday, *before Evening Prayer*, shall examine, instruct, and catechize the youth and ignorant persons of his parish. And even in those places where the disuse of the practice may be partially compensated by the establishment of an effective National or Sunday School, there is nothing to relieve the clergyman from the responsibility of vigilant personal superintendence over the progress of the pupils. Zeal and sincerity will always be able to preserve the spirit of the canon, even where a rigorous adherence to its letter may be inexpedient or impracticable; and this cannot fail to suggest that, according to the

genius of the English Church, the presence of the minister is the very life and soul of all religious instruction.

We are exceedingly concerned to perceive that the Archdeacon is by no means satisfied with the state of parochial psalmody within his jurisdiction. We sympathize very sincerely with the disturbance of spirit inflicted upon him by the provoking indolence or stupidity of his rustics; we were almost tempted, however, to forgive their vexatious inaptitude for melody, on finding that it drew forth from their Ordinary a most eloquent and affecting vindication of that sacred exercise: we cannot forbear the insertion of it entire.

“The next question, to which an unfavourable answer has been given, relates to Psalmody. This at first sight may appear, but indeed it is not, a point of secondary moment. Inferior perhaps to the preceding in moral worth, it comes scarcely a whit behind it in moral influence. In all the contests and all the triumphs of the catholic cause they have been joined together—let them never be put asunder.

“Surely there lives not a man who thinks scorn of this sacred and pleasant exercise. In every age and every clime, in all the changes and chances of life, it is the natural expression of religious gratitude, the appropriate language of the devotional spirit. It has been the pious recreation of the merry, the midnight solace of the captive, the animating farewell of the martyr. It has lent its aid to record the thanksgiving of the legislator and of the conqueror; to grace the marriage festival, and to consecrate the memory of the mighty fallen. It has been the employment of patriarchs and prophets, of priests and kings, of apostles and angels—yea, and of One, it should seem, higher far than cherubim and seraphim.

“At the creation of man, the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy; at his redemption, the glad tidings were chaunted by a multitude of the heavenly host: and at the final consummation of his being, when every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, shall be summoned before the Creator, it may be that the spirits of just men made perfect shall be welcomed into the portals of the New Jerusalem by ‘the harps of God,’ and by the voice of choral symphony—a voice as of many waters, a voice as of mighty thunderings. Called to see their Saviour face to face, and to serve him day and night, it may be that they shall join the innumerable company of angels, and sing the new song, saying, ‘Blessing, honour, glory and power, unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.’

“But Psalmody has its glories and its uses in this world also. When the gospel was to be propagated, St. Paul well knew how to employ its instrumentality. Let the heathen, drunk with wine, celebrate aloud the triumphant revelries of idolatry; but his children in the faith, filled with the spirit, were to speak among themselves, to teach and admonish one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace,



and making melody in their hearts to the Lord. Hence we are told the early converts used to assemble together, and chaunt in alternate parts a hymn to Christ, as to a Deity. Again, when the gospel, long hid, was to be restored to us—when, rescued from the motley and meretricious disguisements of the Romish ceremonial, it was to shine forth afresh in all the pure and primitive beauty of holiness, the Reformers found in psalmody the most elevating of virtuous excitements, and the strongest bond of congregational union.

“ Sacred music was a regular and splendid appointment of the Hebrew ritual ; it is an original and essential part of the Liturgy ; it is the very life and soul of every new method of dissenting worship. Why then is it so rarely invited to impart a solemn interest to our parochial services ?—to shed abroad its blessed and joyous influences on our hearts and understandings ? And yet no one can witness its absence without feeling that something is wanting to raise his thoughts, to kindle his affections, to sanctify his imagination, and to harmonize the whole man in the hour of devotion. Then does it not argue a want of taste, or rather, and still more, a want of zeal amongst us, my brethren, that whilst every conventicle is made to resound with hallelujahs, the courts of the Temple alone should ever fail to repeat the strains of the sweet Psalmist of Israel ?—that, whilst all Creation, every thing that hath breath, is summoned by the voice of Nature and of Inspiration to sing praises unto the Lord, we only, the favoured sons of the Church, should at any time seem to maintain an ungracious or indolent silence ?”—*Bayley*, p. 21-24.

It is melancholy enough to stoop from these raptures, and to alight once more upon this world of discord ; and we know not that the contrast would be much softened, if our first visit, after our descent, should be to a village church, where it might be our lot to witness the pride of the rustic orchestra, and to listen to the groans of the bassoon, and the screechings of the violin, and the braying of the hautboy, and the uplifting of the stave, in the midst of noises fitted to raise commotion any where but in the heart, and which might sometimes be thought to represent the sufferings of unblest spirits, rather than the joys and transports of the just ! The abandonment of parochial psalmody is bad enough ; but really the coarse caricature of it we have occasionally been doomed to witness, appears to us decidedly worse. It never fails to remind us of the paintings we sometimes meet with, in which brawny saints, and sublunary looking seraphims, are portrayed as inflating their cheeks on wind-instruments of every imaginable calibre, or astride upon enormous bass-viols, which they appear to be scraping with truly carnal vigour and perseverance. Now, where an organ cannot be had, is it not better to trust wholly to the human voice ? Truly, they of the Tabernacle seem to have a better understanding in these matters, than we of the Establishment ! In this respect (perchance, too, in some others) they are wiser in their generation than the children of the Church. In-

strumental music they generally reject, and yet their psalmody often shows how advantageously it may be dispensed with. And surely it is difficult to imagine why any congregation of the Establishment should not accomplish what is achieved by every knot of Dissenters. The Archdeacon (with whom hope is ever predominant, and whose last look at every subject is always directed to the bright side of it)—the Archdeacon is quite confident that this defect in our worship admits, in a great degree, of an easy remedy.

“I take upon me to say, that in almost any parish, where there is room for a Sunday-school, this defect may in great measure, and easily, be supplied. A few weeks only of teaching, with moderate encouragement, will produce a choir, which, if it may not exactly satisfy the fastidious ear, will assuredly please the pious worshipper—will tend to unite all hearts and voices in the expression of one common feeling—and will relieve at once the minister and his audience.”—*Bayley*, p. 24.

We know not whether the Archdeacon is much in the habit of attending the London churches; we should rather suspect that he is not: for if he were, we apprehend that even his apparently sanguine temper would be a little dashed! With all the facilities for excellent psalmody—with powerful organs, numerous congregations, and often with a multitude of charity children, who want nothing but kind and steady care to mould them into a body of admirable choristers—with all these appliances and means at their command, they do, some of them, contrive to convert this joyous spiritual exercise into a positive physical infliction upon the whole assembly, those individuals only excepted whose ears are quite insatiable of noise. Some instances\* unquestionably may be found in which the music and singing are under the management of a watchful minister, and of an able but unambitious organist, who makes a judicious selection of melodies, and trains the children to a soft and subdued style of execution; and then the effect is unspeakably soothing and delightful. But what would Dr. Bayley say if his senses were assailed, Sunday after Sunday, by the stormy roar of the organ, and the tumultuary “violence of song,” which express the “*awful mirth*” of many of our London places of worship? And how would his spirit be stirred within him, were he to hear, (as we have heard,) that while the Establishment is thus trifling with this sacred source of influence, there are actually persons in London who derive good incomes solely from the employment of teaching dissenting congregations to sing!

In the admonitory portion of the Charge, we find the duty of

\* Of these the most remarkable, perhaps, is the present Bishop of Chester's Church of St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate; the psalmody of which is known to be an object of his Lordship's anxious and constant attention.

personal intercourse between the pastor and his flock described and enforced with great beauty and feeling; and such exhortations come with tenfold power from any one who combines in his own person official rank with the character of a working parish priest. That clergyman can be in no very enviable frame of mind, who can peruse this part of the Charge without feeling his heart burn within him. If his cure be in a country parish, the minister may find here an engaging picture of those blessed ministrations which enable an individual to carry round to every cottage within the circuit of his labours, the most sacred influences and heartfelt charities of the Gospel. If a city parish, with its thousands and its tens of thousands, be the scene of his exertions, he will look with many a sigh upon this delightful exhibition of duties, from which he is almost utterly cut off. He will be led to meditate sorrowfully on that strange effect of mixed and crowded populations, which often draws as impassable a line of separation between the minister and a large proportion of his people, as if they were kept asunder by a mighty gulf; and he will form many an earnest wish that some means could be devised for carrying the influence of the Church into all the recesses of that vast labyrinth—a large and densely peopled district.

It is impossible to look without compassion on the condition of a conscientious clergyman, planted in the midst of ten, or twenty, or, perhaps, thirty thousand people, whom the law is pleased to call his parishioners, and with the care of whose souls he has been solemnly charged. Even had he no other occupation under heaven, than to go about from house to house among them; and were he gifted with a burning zeal, and an energy that knows not weariness,—still years must elapse before he could make any sensible approach towards that sort of omnipresence which is requisite for the most effective discharge of pastoral duty. As it is, however, his attention is distracted, and his time often cut into fragments, by the incessant interruptions of the weekly routine, and by the vexatious intrusion of numberless little secularities which the law fixes upon him, and which in various shapes invade the sanctity of his spiritual engagements. In addition to these calls, he has to prepare himself for the awful business of addressing his people from the pulpit, on the concerns of immortality, once, or perhaps twice, in the course of each Sabbath—a work, for which alone the meditation and labour of a very large portion of the week would hardly be more than sufficient. Can it, then, be a subject of wonder that many of the private houses should remain unvisited? And when the Ordinary inquires, “Doth your minister visit the poor and sick readily and gladly?” can any other



answer be reasonably looked for, but that which is so frequently returned—that he doth so *when sent for*? And can we be surprised to find that the Dissenters are ready to step into the vacancy which the Church appears to have left, and that their emissaries should be found by the bed-side of the sick and dying, from which the solitary officiating minister is detained by the pressure and entanglement of other occupations? The Dissenter, be it remembered, has no funerals to perform, *or to wait for*; no marriages to solemnize; no register to keep or to search; no certificates to sign or to fill up. He has, therefore, full leisure to appear among the afflicted as the messenger of comfort, and thus, whether intentionally or not, to spread over a whole parish the unjust persuasion, that he alone is deserving of their confidence, and that the clergy are destitute of all proper care for the souls committed to their charge!

How this class of evils is to be remedied, it must be left for higher wisdom and influence than ours to decide. We cannot, however, persuade ourselves that ecclesiastical discipline and government is a system in its very nature so inflexible, that it refuses to mould itself to all the exigencies that may arise. We can scarcely believe that there is not, somewhere, the power to supply all the spiritual wants of the most crowded population. Would there be any thing adverse to the spirit of the Establishment, in the appointment of a subordinate class of ministers, who might discharge the offices of a sort of *brotherhood of charity*, and who, in that character, might go about among the people, and do, *for* the Church, that which the separatists are now doing, in a certain sense, in opposition to the Church? That some such agency as this is grievously needed in large city parishes, it is quite impossible to deny; and, if it cannot be supplied, it is to no purpose for us to shut our eyes against the obvious consequences, namely, that a most important department of spiritual ministration will continue to be performed by persons who disown our communion.

There is one topic which the Archdeacon has touched upon with most judicious delicacy, not in the text of his charge, but in the snug retirement of a note at the end of it; where the subject is alluded to, among sundry other matters, which he has contrived to introduce with a spirit of innocent, good-humoured pleasantry, fitted even to “smooth the raven down of” orthodoxy, “till it smiles.” The subject in question is that of field-sports, in all their variety, considered as forming part of the recreation of a divine.

“This, qui facilè intelligitur, non nominabitur, may not indeed have any thing in it of moral turpitude, any thing of personal impropriety.

Yet, if the use of it, from its very nature, be liable to degenerate into abuse—if, as experience proves, it too often become a ruling passion—if its excitement be seldom compatible with seriousness and composure of spirit—if it occupy time pledged to parochial business, or to the ‘daily reading and weighing of the Scriptures’—if it engross funds which might be better employed—and, lastly, if it give offence, as it is almost sure to do, to our people—if such be the case, let the minister honestly ask himself, how far a *regular occupation* of this nature is consistent with his obligations and his duty?

“In the beginning of the thirteenth century, and throughout the fourteenth, archdeacons, yea and other higher ordinaries, are prohibited from ‘making their progresses with hunting dogs,’ whilst the business of visitation was handed over to the inferior officers. At the present day one may venture to pledge himself, ‘*si quid promittere . . . possum*,’ not to offend, wilfully at least, in this point. Concil. Lond. 1200. Wilk. i. 505. ii. 416. 676. 698.”—*Bayley*, pp. 45, 46.

In this language there is a meekness of wisdom, which, though it may fail to convince an inveterate clerical Nimrod, cannot possibly awaken his resentment. Now, we are not at all more disposed than the Archdeacon, to give offence to gentlemen of this very anomalous class; but it really is an office of charity to apprise them, distinctly, of the very strange figure they present to the eyes of all sober-minded persons. Perhaps the matter may be best brought home to their own convictions, by considering what would probably be the impression made by the first appearance, on any stage, of such a character as a clerical sportsman. Let us imagine that we had never seen or heard of such a combination before: what would be the *first* effect of it upon our nervous system? Would it not operate, like other strange and incongruous mixtures, and raise unextinguishable laughter among gods and men? We can scarcely fancy such a spectacle as one of the judges of the land riding his own racer for the sweepstakes; or figure to ourselves a lord chancellor ambitious of eclipsing the memory of his predecessor in the custody of the great seal, Sir Christopher Hatton—“that inimitable dancer of galliards,”—and seeking at Almack’s for recreation from the toils of the woolsack or the bench. But no one can doubt of the incontrollable merriment which would be raised by such an exhibition; allayed, indeed, in the minds of the more serious spectators by a conviction that the parties must be under some influence adverse to the sanity of their mental powers. And this conviction would certainly not be weakened by the grave allegations of those venerable personages, that there could be nothing criminal or immoral in mounting a thorough-bred horse, or swimming through the mazes of a quadrille. Now we do vehemently opine, that—to all dispassionate lookers on—the pursuits of the field, if seen for the

first time engrafted on the character and habits of a priest, would have an appearance to the full as grotesque and odd, as the diversions above alluded to, when exemplified in the persons of dignified and solemn magistrates. We have recently read of some place in South America, where the religious orders are much addicted to cock-fighting; and we presume that even our clerical pursuers of game, themselves, would be somewhat staggered at the sight of the holy brethren assembled round the pit, each with his bird under his arm, and betting as if his salvation depended on the issue of the sport. And yet we do very seriously doubt, whether a spiritual person—whipping, and spurring, and dashing through thick and thin, in the midst of squires, and farmers, and huntsmen, and whippers-in, and the blowing of horns, and the howling of dogs,—we do seriously doubt whether this be a spectacle at all more edifying, or much less ludicrous, than a ring of cock-fighting monks!

To the general body of the clergy themselves we might appeal, on this subject, with the most perfect confidence. They know, full well, that they are not at liberty to consider themselves as country gentlemen in dark-coloured coats: they know, too, that the affectation of any approach to that character is sure to meet with the reward that usually awaits every description of renegades: they are distinctly aware of the scorn with which sporting divines are regarded by the squirarchy of this realm, as well as of the disgust with which they are viewed by their own people: their feelings are elevated far above the wretched ambition of courting the boisterous welcome and good-fellowship of the hunting and fowling classes of the community; for they are not ignorant that persons of that class are sometimes but too apt to give their *outward* support and encouragement to any one who will but make religion sufficiently ridiculous, and thus lower its demands upon their obedience: they are, moreover, deeply impressed with the recollection that their proper office is to wield *the powers of the world to come*; and they know that the contact of low and debasing secularities will steal away their strength, till *the sword of the spirit* drops from their grasp, “*telum imbellis, sine ictu.*”

We are nevertheless afraid that there still remains among the clerical body a remnant faithful to the chase; and by them it is probable that these remarks may be ascribed to a spirit of narrow, illiberal, puritanical austerity. To all such insinuations we should listen with exemplary composure; and in reply to them, we should simply ask these questions: Can there be any mortal now living who will assert, that nothing can degrade a clergyman but positive vice and guilt? Are we to be told, at this time of day, that the clerical profession is not to have its sacred proprieties and its



inviolable decencies, as well as its holy and exalted moralities? Are we to be told, that a minister of religion may be innocently seen one hour attending in the chamber of sickness and of death, and the next, with at least equal anxiety, looking after his hunter in body-clothes? That he may be observed, on Saturday, joining the halloo and the rout, and the coarse turbulence of the field, (in the midst of many a sly sneer at the jockey-parson,) and yet that the same man will be heard with unimpaired reverence on Sunday, when speaking of things which are "lovely and of good report," and "reasoning of righteousness and temperance, and judgment to come?" Are we to be gravely told all this, in a period distinguished from all preceding ones by the general diffusion of intelligence, by the almost omnipresent spirit of inquiry, and by the overpowering sway of public opinion?

No: we venture pretty confidently to pronounce of this class of persons, that their days are numbered; neither the public piety nor the public taste will much longer endure them. The vanities they are following are doomed, at no very distant time, to be swept away into the Paradise of Fools, with other "transitory things, abortive, monstrous, and unkindly mixed." The signs of the times point very plainly to this consummation. Within the memory of living persons, for instance, a man's loyalty and orthodoxy were pretty generally estimated by his riotous libations to Church and King, and his parrot-like and pertinacious cry of *Methodist* at every one who was suspected of saying his prayers and reading his Bible. But these good days are nearly gone by; every decently educated person now knows and feels, that his attachment to the Constitution and the Establishment will never pass current in good society on the strength of his calling hard names and swallowing mighty bumpers. The clergy in general are much too intelligent to believe it safe or creditable for them to be left behind in this career of improvement. A very large portion of them, too, have much more virtue and high principle than to be content with merely following the universal movement: it is both their wisdom and their pride to take a decisive lead in it; they feel that their post is among the standard-bearers of Israel.

On this subject the views of every one must be bright, who has watched the astonishing advancement of the Sacred Profession within the last half-century, and the steady and vigorous pace with which it is still going forward. It is also consolatory to believe—as we do most fervently believe—that the allegiance and attachment of the people are still with the Established Church; and that when they renounce or suspend their communion with it, they often obey, not their own sincere inclina-

tions, but the impulse of some untoward circumstances which they heartily lament. We are persuaded that the clergy at this moment occupy a position from which they may give a movement to the world, if their power is but directed by motives which are *above* the world; and we are convinced that nothing but ignorance, or disregard of their advantages, can prevent their earning, in the fullest measure, the reverence and gratitude of their country, and the title of benefactors to the whole human race.

A spirit, we fully believe, has gone forth, which shall blessedly realize our anticipations and crown our views. That spirit, we trust, will gradually extend a high professional feeling throughout the Sacred Order, and provoke to godly emulation the very humblest of its members. The same spirit, we further hope, will breathe over our Universities, till it has given new vigour and encouragement to those studies which are more immediately connected with the Christian Ministry. The same spirit, we likewise trust, will, by the blessing of God, visit every department of society; and this with a power that might almost create a soul *beneath the ribs of* apathy and spiritual *death*. And, finally, he that hath an ear to hear, let him hear what this same spirit now says to all the faithful sons of the Church by the voice of one of her own ministers.

“ Dismissing these topics of constant and everlasting moment, allow me to conclude with some reflections of a present and peculiar interest. It is a not uncommon idea, and arising possibly from a wholesome fear, that the Church is in danger. To me, I confess, there appears nothing in the aspect of the times, no threatening cloud in the political sky, to create or justify alarm. In the diffusion of knowledge, in the progress of intellect, in the elevation of feeling, in the almost omnipotence of public opinion, I seem indeed to hear the sound of a mighty rushing wind, but cannot tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth.

“ Peradventure some Minister of Grace may be abroad on a purpose of mercy to the Church: and if so, prepare we to wrestle with that mysterious Power till we obtain the blessing. Be it ours to conciliate its alliance, to consecrate its influences, to direct its energies, and devote them to the service of virtue. And this we must do by meeting it, on our parts, with a corresponding tone of professional sentiment; a broader and deeper cultivation of professional learning; an exacter attention to professional duty and discipline; but especially, and above all, by a more fervent charity among ourselves, and by a personal and paternal superintendence of the national education. The Church of England never sought for stability in ignorance or intolerance; it is founded on the everlasting basis of knowledge and liberality. Its strength and prosperity, under heaven, rest on character; and until it shall cease to deserve that support, the common sense of the country, informed and enlightened as it is at the present day, will protect it against any attack of puritanical phrensy or revolutionary violence.

“ Secure in its proud eminence and impregnable fortifications, the ancient city of God, with its beautiful temple, might still have defied the battering-ram and the torch of the Roman. But ‘rank corruption mined all within;’ discord and sedition and profligacy betrayed the gates, and introduced within the walls, even into the most holy place, the abomination of desolation.

“ The Churches of Asia, illuminated by the earliest rays of the sun of Christianity, fostered by apostolical benediction, and enriched by revelations of the spirit, yet fell from their first love, and forgot their first works. Their golden candlestick was removed; as the vessels of a potter, were they broken to shivers; and the place thereof knoweth them no more.

“ The hour perchance—Heaven in its mercy long avert it!—the hour may come, when a similar fate shall attend our own Jerusalem. Now, we triumphantly call upon our brethren to walk about Zion, and go round about her; to tell the towers thereof, to mark well her bulwarks and to consider her palaces. She is ennobled by the towers of state, fortified by the bulwarks of law, and decorated by the palaces of charity. Built upon the rock of ages, and cemented by the blood of martyrdom, her walls are called salvation, and her gates praise.

“ She is all glorious within. In her tabernacle is seen the ark of the Testament: there are the hallowed trophies of liberty; there are the dedicated spoils of genius and learning, of philosophy and science; and the golden harp of poesy is hung upon the horns of her altar. She is indeed altogether lovely; the perfection of beauty, the joy of the whole earth.

“ But though kings be the nursing-fathers of our Church, and queens its nursing-mothers; though it be wedded to the constitution; though it be consecrated in the hearts and memories, the feelings and habits of the people, yet may it fall. A temple at once and a citadel, she may laugh to scorn the rage and tumult of hostile array—she may shake her head at the crafty assaults of infidel treachery: she will own no fear, till her enemies be those of her own house; she will never perish, but by her own right hand. Should she ever cease to be at unity in herself; should her sons, no longer true to themselves, give way to party ambition, popular faction, or personal animosity, to vicious indifference, secular license, or idolatrous covetousness; should the watchman sleep on his watch-tower, the pastors become brutish, or the idle shepherd leave his flock—should the priest’s lips cease to keep knowledge, or false prophets arise, dividing Christ, and saying ‘lo! He is here, or, lo! He is there,’ then verily, and not till then, her time is near to come, her days are numbered, and may not be prolonged. Then shall her glory depart; the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of Britain’s excellency, shall be swept with the besom of destruction.

“ But away with these visions of unreal terror! To the eye of faith a brighter destiny is revealed; a boundless horizon of duty and happiness is set before us. In either hemisphere, Episcopacy has raised her mitred front; and Charity has gone forth from our sanctuary into the dark and cruel places of the earth, to comfort and to ransom, to civilize



by education, and to bless by religion. A Church, which is thus employed as a special instrument of divine providence, will, we humbly and confidently trust, itself experience the special love and protection of divine omnipotence. Surely, like its heavenly Founder, it will increase in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man: surely, we may hope, the devout and patriotic prayer of each of her sons, will be ratified by the fiat of our common Father; “*Esto perpetua!*”

“It remains only, that, with humble and devout hearts, we approach the throne of grace:

“Almighty and everlasting God, by whose spirit the whole body of the Church is governed and sanctified, receive our supplications and prayers, which we offer before thee, for all estates of men in thy holy Church; that every member of the same, in his vocation and ministry, may truly and godly serve thee, through our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. *Amen.*”—*Bayley*, p. 32.

We have already taken so wide a career of observation, that our remaining space is not sufficient to give to Mr. Hornby's sermon the full and distinguished notice which it deserves. It is, in truth, a performance of rare excellence and beauty; and if its perusal leaves any feeling of dissatisfaction behind it, it is, that we have before us an *almost* solitary monument—(ὀλίγον τε φίλον τε)—of the intellect and piety which produced it. Its text is from 1 Cor. xiv. 33: “God is not the author of confusion, but of peace; as in all the Churches of the Saints.” We are unable to follow the preacher through those parts of his discourse in which he explains and enforces, with a singular mastery of his subject, the principle of Ecclesiastical Order, as “grounded on nothing less than the nature of God himself, and the end of his universal laws.” We hasten to that portion of his address in which he shows how fatally the principle of order is wounded by every Christian minister whose life is at variance with the spirit of his calling. The sentiments of Mr. Hornby are so powerfully auxiliary to those we have expressed above, that we shall not scruple to give them entire. The extract is of rather formidable length, but we cannot spare a single line of it; and we most confidently promise our readers that it will richly repay their patience and attention.

“It is in peculiar reference to the point of order that I would now press upon my younger brethren of the ministry a strict and holy attention to the great business of our lives. I say a holy attention; so, as that we may shape the life, if possible in every circumstance, with reference to its sacred end,—to its bearing upon the duties and success of our ministerial functions. The very characteristic of a clergyman is holiness;—abstraction from secularities;—separation, as respects his tastes and tempers, his feelings and habits, not only from a sensual and wicked, but from a vain and idle, a turbulent and promiscuous world.

It is perhaps too much to say,—as a great authority has said—‘a clergyman should be a clergyman, and nothing else:’ but it is strictly true that he should be a clergyman in every thing. Whatever advantages of rank and fortune he may enjoy, whatever qualities of heart, of mind, and of manner he may possess, he should interweave them into his spiritual character, compelling all to minister to his entireness as a clergyman. He has a most difficult, as well as a most important task to perform: for it is to be performed in the midst of that very world, from which, in heart and mind, he must be separate. It is a great mistake to think that a clergyman ought not to be a man of the world, in the best sense of those words; as indicating a man who both knows human nature, and the particular character of the men whom it is his immediate duty to converse with. It is fitting too that he should be imbued with much of the written wisdom of the world; that the shepherd who leads the Israel of God should be skilled in the learning of the Egyptians. Above all it is, I might almost say, an essential of his effective ministry, that he love the world as a Christian may and ought to love it; that he be free from the sour misanthropy which too often infects the recluse; and that his heart expand towards all men in brotherly kindness and charity. ‘I pray, not that thou shouldest take them out of the world,’ was the Divine Master’s petition for those whom he left as a light in that world which he was quitting: ‘I pray, not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil.’ When left in it they were to be maintained there in the purity of a higher than a worldly principle. ‘They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world:’ and how did he pray that they should be kept? In the holiness of the spirit of the divine word—‘sanctify them with thy truth;’ ‘as thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world,’ that they might instruct, reform, and edify it; that they might be, therein, pure, active, exemplary; that they might go about doing good; but that they might live above it, and ‘keep themselves unspotted from it.’

“With the men of the world we must mix: but, that we may perform our ministry with effect, we must mix with them,—though freely,—yet in such a form that they may see in us that distinctness which becomes those who are devoted to the service of God in the world, in order that they may lead others in the way to heaven. If, as the salt of the earth, we must descend into it to preserve it fertile and uncorrupt, we ought yet to mingle with it so as rather to diffuse a sanctity of our own, than ourselves to imbibe an earthly savour. This may be done; and pity it is we do not see it done commonly. All the learning, and many of the graces and accomplishments of the world, may be a part, and a most harmonious part, in the character of a truly saintly clergyman. He may have all the world’s activity;—more than all its cheerfulness. There may be added, and without injuring the saintly harmony, the world’s rank and honours, and the world’s wealth. But, in each and all of these, the purifying line of distinction must be carefully maintained. All things must be kept subordinate, and so in their proper place; they must bring ornament and strength, but no defilement, no desecration, into the sanctuary. Learning must not make us merely speculative; since it is for works of saving activity that we had need be wise. Accomplishments,

though they sweeten our means of general intercourse, must not cast upon the most serious of human engagements a suspicion of frivolity or of strenuous idleness. Our activity must be calm,—our cheerfulness such as needs not restraint: our rank and honours must be fitly borne, as a part in the graduated decorations of the world, not as made for ourselves, and to be vainly rejoiced in. Our wealth must be dispensed as a deposit entrusted to us, not as a possession in which we trust. In a word, we must use the world as not abusing it in any of its good things; we must give evidence that it does not lower and hold us down; all the while we live in it we must live as men ‘whose conversation is in heaven.’

“If there be a painful anomaly in existence it is the heart and mind of a clergyman in whom the world has predominant rule; who is seduced from the proper sanctity of his order by its business or its pleasures, its honours or absurdities. A profligate clergyman is a monster in nature?—a character of rare occurrence, and, when appearing, odious and disgusting even in the eyes of profligates themselves. But it is not of so rare concurrence—(though I thank God it is every day more and more rare)—to see a man belonging to the ministry who mixes in the world with less of discretion than is for the good of others or of himself: a man who minds, and exemplarily performs, the great duties of his peculiar office and state; but who disregards, and therefore offends in, the less momentous, but certainly not less visible, niceties of duty: a man who maintains the separating quality of holiness up to a point; but who extends it not into minute particularities. There is a moral and religious confusion in this: we are a distinct class—separated unto the Lord: upon every part of our lives should be inscribed the uniform and conspicuous character of holiness. It is a written precept to ‘abstain from all appearance of evil.’ We must not even be misconstrued, if any reasonable care of ours may make the whole of our character appear right. We must ‘give no offence in any thing, that the ministry be not blamed’—lest we cast a reflected censure on our order. ‘Every vessel in Jerusalem and in Judah should be holiness unto the Lord of Hosts.’ In the homely, but expressive, analogy of Scripture ‘the pots in the Lord’s house shall be like the bowls before the altar.’ Even ‘upon the very bridles of the horses—(so minute is the attention to mere externals)—there shall be holiness unto the Lord.’ Let this, my brethren, be our characteristic—holiness in the great essentials diffusing itself into all the most, apparently, insignificant parts. Without any affection of precise singularity, let us be marked by all men as distinct,—signalized by traits of our own. They will love us, as well as respect us, when they see that we are every thing that our separate order calls us to be; that we have an enlightened reason for all we do; and that we make a conscience of doing it. Let there be no inconsistency in any part of our lives, may ‘the very God of peace sanctify us wholly!’”—*Hornby*, pp. 21—27.

The above passage irresistibly recalls us, for one moment, to the clerical brethren of the chase. If Mr. Hornby’s sermon, or this portion of it, should chance to fall into the hands of any one of them, we would earnestly beseech him, first, to give it a patient and attentive perusal. And when he has done this, we would



further ask of him, to go at once—and while the influence of it is fresh upon his mind—to the closet, adjoining, perhaps, the very shelves on which his Concordance and “Common-place Book of the Bible” are reposing; and having opened it, to survey, there hung up, the whole costume and equipment of the field:—the powder flask, the shot-belt, the dog-whip, the dog-whistle, the Joe Manton, the buff leather gaiters, and the short-tailed jacket, with its endless apparatus of pockets; and when he has gone over the items of this precious inventory, we would beg of him to ask himself, “Is not all this sad masking stuff,” wherein to disguise the character so admirably portrayed above? Is not this sorry gear for one whose highest honour is to be called a *fisher of men*; a captivator of immortal souls; one, whose net should incessantly ply to raise up sinners from the depths of Satan, and to transfer them to the wells and fountains of Salvation? We do in sober earnestness recommend this experiment. We, seriously, have great hopes from the effect of the contrast. We do not despair of its inducing the executioner of pheasants, and the pursuer of vermin, to ponder a little on the nature of those strange transformations he is perpetually undergoing, from an evangelist into a sportsman; and to reflect, with something like dismay, on the vile enchantment, by which alone that almost Circèan metamorphosis could be accomplished!

We produce the testimony of Mr. Hornby, on such matters, with the greatest confidence, not only because it is the testimony of a mind of the first order, but also because it is *not* the testimony of one whose allegiance to the Church is at all dubious, or whose mental vision has suffered the slightest disturbance from the influence of fanaticism. It is moreover the testimony, not of a recluse but a social man; a man too (if we mistake not) of high connections, and affluent means; particulars which we mention, because, to a certain extent, it is true, that “where virtue is, these make more virtuous:” they show, at least, that the doctrine of self-denial is not here preached by one who disparages pursuits and enjoyments placed beyond his reach. The suggestions and opinions of Mr. Hornby can never be put down by the stupid outcry of Puritans and Methodists!

On the whole, we rise from the perusal of this composition with inexpressible refreshment of spirit. It seems to speak to us of glorious days in store for the Established Church. It animates us too with the spectacle of a man who is content to bring his treasures and his precious things, his frankincense and gold, and to lay them at the feet of the Saviour. It proves, triumphantly, that the most splendid resources of intellect can find no employment so truly dignified as the Service of the Giver.

ART. XI.—*The Expectations formed by the Assyrians, that a great Deliverer would appear, about the time of our Lord's Advent, demonstrated.* London. Bagster. 1826. 8vo. 10s.

THERE are few parts of learning so involved in obscurity, as the history of Pagan Idolatry. It may, perhaps, be some satisfaction to us to think that the ancients themselves knew even less of the matter than we do; but if so, it furnishes a strong argument for the necessity of being very cautious in drawing our conclusions. We believe it may safely be said, that there is not one among all the fabled deities of antiquity, whom (if the writers of antiquity may be trusted,) it is not possible to identify with every other—Saturn, Jupiter, Mercury, Pan, Hercules, Priapus, Bacchus; Bel, Moloch, Chemosh; Taut, Thoth, Osiris; Buddha, Vishnou, Siva; all and each of these may be shown, by arguments of weight, to be one and the same person. And whether we suppose this person to have been the Sun, or to have been Adam, or Seth, or Enoch, or Noah, or Shem, or Ham, or Japhet, the conclusion will be still the same; each of them, it may be shown, was worshipped as the Sun; and all of them, wherever their worship was established, were severally considered as the Great Mythological Divinity. So far, it would not appear that there is any room for much difference of opinion; at least, not if ancient authorities may be depended on. But who are we to understand as the Great Divinity of heathen mythology? At this point a vast field of opinion and speculation opens to us, upon which it is not our present intention to enter. One thing appears to be quite clear: that the symbols under which the principal dogmas, both of the eastern and western idolatry were represented, manifestly point to one common origin, the true explanation of which is to be found in the book of Genesis.

We do not mean to say that there is any solid reason to suppose that the Heathens borrowed their opinions from the book of Genesis; but that they drew them from the same common source, namely, from the traditional knowledge of the Creation of the world, and of the deluge, as that knowledge existed among mankind both before and after the time of Moses. All that was true in the tradition of mankind, at that age, has been recorded in the Pentateuch; we find the same truths in Sanconiathon, in Berosus, in Manetho, and in the symbols of heathen superstition; but dressed out in fables, and mixed with various fantastical additions. Supposing the Mosaic account to be correct, this is precisely what might have been anticipated; the supposition popularly received, that the heathens borrowed their knowledge

from the Jews, or even were instructed in it by the Patriarchs, is not only attended with historical difficulty, but would remove one of the very strongest possible testimonies to the truth of what Moses has written; inasmuch as in proving the truth of his history, it is better to suppose that he was merely prevented by God from falling into error, than that his knowledge of the facts which he has related was directly communicated to him by inspiration; seeing that he has conveyed to us no information concerning the history of our first parents and of the deluge, which might not have been preserved in tradition, nor which probably would not have been so preserved, supposing the facts to be really true. From Adam to Noah, there was but one man, namely Methuselah, who was contemporary with both; from Noah to Abraham, only one, namely Shem, who saw them both; from Abraham to Joseph, there is but one man, namely Isaac, Joseph's grandfather; and Amram, the father of Moses, might have conversed with Joseph.\*

Supposing therefore the Mosaic History to be genuine, the difficulty is not to explain how the truths which he has communicated to us came so long to be preserved in tradition, but how they came so soon to be depraved. With respect to the history of the deluge, there is not a single particular set down by Moses, but may be found adumbrated under some idolatrous symbol or other; and indeed the fragment of Berosus preserved in Eusebius, and the tract of Lucian concerning the "Syrian Goddess," especially the latter, contain decisive evidence to the knowledge of the heathens on every point connected with the history of Noah and his family. The traces which remain of ante-diluvian tradition are fewer and more uncertain; but they are sufficient for verifying the account which Moses has delivered. To say nothing of the division of time, both with respect to the days of the week, and the number of hours in the day, the supposed sacredness of the seventh day, the institution of sacrifice, as well as of a great variety of co-incidencies between the mythological cosmogonies and the true history of the creation:—the symbolical worship of the serpent alone, which obtained among all the nations of antiquity, is a fact which stands prominently forward. If the reader wishes to satisfy himself on this subject, he may turn to Eusebius (*Præp. Evang. lib. i. c. 10.*) where he will find the reasons, stated at large, which the ancient sages gave for this apparently unaccountable superstition. But whatever difficulty they may have had in explaining the meaning of this strange worship, we need have none, if we may believe Faber, who tells us (*vol. i. 442.*) on the

\* Allix, *Reflexions on Scripture*, p. i. cxvii.



authority of ancient writers whom he quotes, that "Hercules was sometimes represented in the act of contending with a serpent, whose head was placed under his heel;" he adds on the same authority, that the serpent was supposed to be the same as that which guarded the golden fruit in the Garden of Hesperides. Two sculptured figures, he also tells us, are yet extant in one of the oldest Pagodas, the former of which represents Chrishna, an incarnation of Vishnou, trampling on the crushed head of a serpent; while in the other, the poisonous reptile is exhibited encircling the deity in its folds, and biting his heel.

It is evident, then, we think, that the history of the Fall was preserved alive in the tradition of mankind from the earliest ages; but we are acquainted with no passage in any writer of remote antiquity, nor with any mythological symbol of any kind, which would lead us to suppose, that the belief and expectation of a "Deliverer" was preserved among the Heathens. The expectation of a King that was to arise in the east, to which Tacitus and Suetonius allude, as existing about the time when Christ was born, has always seemed to us, as owing its origin entirely to the dispersion of the Jews over every part of the world, in the time preceding Christianity, and to the consequent knowledge of their prophecies, which was by this means spread among mankind. Had this opinion been part of the tradition of mankind, at the period when our evidence for the existence of the other parts of ante-diluvian tradition is found, it might have been conjectured that some clear hints of it would have been traceable either in the writings or in the worship of the early heathens. This no writer, hitherto, has pretended to have discovered; we are able to trace the *delivery* of the promise to mankind, among the superstitions of every nation of antiquity; but the true *sense* of it was preserved only among the Jews, and by them not fully understood, until subsequent communications from God had rendered the original prophecy intelligible.

In saying this, we are speaking only of the state of the question, as it was before this work of Mr. Nolan's appeared. His object is to show that the knowledge of a Deliverer existed among mankind from the earliest times, and in fact formed an integral part of the religious institutions of the heathens, both of Asia and Europe. This belief, he thinks, was the foundation of the worship that was paid to one of the principal deities among the Assyrians; it afterwards spread, he says, into Egypt and Phenicia, and finally constituted the worship that was paid to Mercury among the western nations of the world.

Abstractedly, there is nothing at all improbable or paradoxical

in the proposition which Mr. Nolan maintains; on the contrary, it is one to which we should very readily yield our belief on any reasonable evidence; and though we do not think it to be a matter of importance, viewed as a theological point, whether he is right or wrong, yet we confess that we opened his book with every disposition to embrace his opinion. The proof of it would have given a neatness and completeness to the argument, from tradition in confirmation of the patriarchal religion, which, though not at all necessary to establish the credit of the book of Genesis, would yet seem to be gratifying to the imagination.

- But it is in literature as in war: a man may sometimes deserve victory who is not able to command it. If it had been in the power of mere learning to establish the point which Mr. Nolan labours, or if logical conclusions could be made good by strenuousness of argument, his success would certainly have been conspicuous. As it is, the only conviction which we have obtained from a very attentive perusal of his work, is great respect for the extensive reading which it displays; our belief in the proposition which he has maintained with so much ingenuity and such stores of erudition, is not at all advanced; and we can very truly say that we are sorry for it. It is somewhat difficult to analyze the argument of Mr. Nolan, but we will endeavour to place it before our readers as intelligibly as we can.

We are told that in some mountains of the east, not far from Babylon, a sect exists, known to the orientalists under the name of Sabaists, who trace their religion up to the patriarch Seth, and whom therefore Mr. Nolan calls Sethites. The name of Sabaists, or Sabians, they profess to derive from Sabi, the son of Enoch; but the object of their more peculiar veneration is the first-mentioned patriarch, whose writings, Mr. Nolan tells us, (he does not say on what authority,) they still profess to retain. They acknowledge the Divine Author of Christianity, but hold this belief in conjunction with such a variety of impure practices and absurd tenets, as excludes them from being numbered among Christians; they would rather seem to be the same with a sect of Heretics mentioned by Epiphanius, under the name of Sethians, who classes them in the same division with two other sects of a similar character, such as the Cainites and Ophites, an account of whom is given by Fabricius, in his *Codex Pseudeisigraphus*.

These Sethians, or Sethites, Mr. Nolan labours to identify with the ancient Sabæans, described by Maimonides, whose supposed descendants are spoken of, at great length, by Hyde, in his *Hist. Vet. Pers.* Presuming this identity to be established, he next endeavours to show that the tradition of a Deliverer has existed among these people, from the very remotest antiquity, even

from before the days of Moses. The proof of this position he draws from the Epistle of St. Jude. The Apostle speaks of those "*who have gone into the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam.*" By these last, Mr. Nolan thinks that an evident allusion is made to the Sethites; but a still more important part of the Epistle is that where St. Jude quotes a prophecy of Enoch, foretelling the "*coming of the Lord to Judgment.*" It is certain, he says, that Enoch was numbered, by the Sethites, among the founders of their sect, and therefore it cannot be doubted, that this prophecy was to be found among their sacred books. Moreover, since the authenticity of the prophecy is admitted by an inspired Apostle, who uses it as an authority, of course it must have existed from the earliest antiquity. It was therefore known to Balaam, and to the Sethites of his day, who lived in Assyria, of which country Balaam was a native. All these several points Mr. Nolan enlarges upon at some length; and having thus laid his foundation, he proceeds to build up his hypothesis by arguments of a more direct kind. These are chiefly drawn from a new version which he proposes of some expressions in Balaam's celebrated prophecy (Numb. xxiii.); but before we proceed to an examination of this part of his proofs, it may perhaps be convenient to direct our consideration, first, to the several positions laid down by him as preliminary facts: when we shall see the difficulties with which these are encumbered, we shall be better prepared to form a correct judgment of some of his after opinions. We are ready to do full justice to the learning and ability which Mr. Nolan has displayed in the manner in which he has drawn out his proofs; but we doubt extremely whether they amount to that absolute demonstration which he seems to suppose.

The first point which he lays down, but which we are far from thinking that he has established, is, that the Sethites of whom Epiphanius speaks are the same as the Sabæans of whom Maimonides tells us. There is no allusion to such an opinion in the account given of them by Epiphanius; and by Tertullian they are expressly designated as *Judaismi hæreticos*. In the Codex Pseudeisigraphus of Fabricius, vol. i. xlviii., we have a brief history of their chief opinions, from which we should certainly have drawn this last conclusion; indeed the summary which Mr. Nolan himself gives us of their doctrines, as explained by Hyde, from the writings of their supposed descendants in the present day, appears to us, as clearly pointing to a Jewish origin. Again, if we look to Maimonides, there is still the same absence of all evidence in support of our author's opinion. We are told (Mor. Nevochim, pars iii. xxxix.) that it is well known that Abraham was educated among the Zabæans, *quæ gens totum terrarum orbem impleverat,*



and not any particular spot in Assyria, as Mr. Nolan appears to intimate. They worshipped the Sun, and the Moon, and the Stars, according to this learned Jew; and with respect to any opinions which they may afterwards have adopted, any one may see, says he, "*qui leviter tantum et superficialiter rem consideret, conficta esse ab illis* POSTEA QUAM LEX NOSTRA GENTIBUS INNOTUIT." But neither in his account of their present or original opinions, does Maimonides use any word which would lead us to identify them with the Sethites. In his tract upon "Idolatry," of which Vossius, at the end of his learned book *de Idolatria*, has given us a translation, the origin of the Sabæan heresy is directly ascribed by Maimonides, not only to the times of Enoch, but even to Enoch himself: *ipse etiam Enos inter errantes erat*. Further we must observe, that the Apostle St. Jude speaks of the *Cainites*, and of those who had gone into the "errors of Balaam," but he says nothing of the Sethites mentioned by Epiphanius. Whether these last are to be understood by those who fell into "the errors of Balaam," is the point to be proved; but we are not aware of any fact, nor does our author adduce any, by which such an opinion can be shown to have any solid foundation. With respect to the modern Sethites, even supposing them, as we do, to be a remnant of an ancient sect, whatever evidence there is upon this point goes to prove that they were Jewish, and not patriarchal heretics; as to their own declarations on the subject, be they what they may, we should regard them as of little value; and looking at their doctrines, we agree with Tertullian and Maimonides in thinking that they are mere corruptions of the Jewish Scriptures. Thus much with respect to our opinion of the proof on which the supposition of Balaam having been a Sethite is founded, and which afterwards is made so important a link in Mr. Nolan's reasoning: we do not say that the son of Beor was or was not a Sethite, but merely that there is no evidence to warrant such a supposition.

With respect to the prophecy of Enoch, quoted by St. Jude, and from which Mr. Nolan thinks that the knowledge of a "Deliverer" must necessarily have been known to the ancient Sabæans: even supposing that the use made of this prophecy by the Apostle proves that he himself believed it to be genuine, and that this opinion of the Apostle's necessarily involves the fact of its being so, still it remains to be proved, both that the knowledge of it was preserved among the *Sethites*, (of whom no mention is made by the Apostle,) and also that the Sethites of Epiphanius and the ancient Sabæans are the same. When St. Paul (Titus, i. 12.) tells the Cretans that "*one of themselves, even a prophet of their own*," calls them "*liars and evil beasts*," no one supposes that the Apostle is to be understood as attributing a divine character to

the writings of Callimachus or Epimenides, or whomsoever the writer may be whose words are quoted; but merely that the Apostle was fighting the Cretans with their own weapons. There is certainly some difficulty in putting this construction upon the argument of St. Jude; but if the prophecy which he quotes belonged to the book of Enoch, of which some large fragments have been preserved by Syncellus, and which is still supposed to be preserved among the Jews, by one of whom it is quoted with praise, (Fabricius, *Cod. Pseud. supra.*) it would be quite evident that the Apostle was only employing it as an *argumentum ad hominem* against the particular persons to whom he writes, and not as a demonstrative argument. If this last supposition be thought, nevertheless, not to agree with the Apostle's manner of expressing himself, in that case we should agree with Wolfius, that the Apostle was quoting, not from any actual book, but merely from the authority of a tradition, which, however, there is not any evidence for assigning to an Assyrian origin. The whole dependence of Mr. Nolan's argument rests upon the words "error of Balaam," which, if we refer to his supposed Sabæan heresy, and not to his cupidity, will leave us quite at a loss to explain the meaning of "for reward," (*ἀντὶ τοῦ μισθοῦ*), which immediately follows. The "error of Balaam for reward" is the same, we imagine, as the "way of Balaam," which Peter speaks of, "*who loved the wages of unrighteousness.*"—(2 Pet. ii. 15.) We do not wish to press our objection to Mr. Nolan's opinions in this part of his work, farther than the spirit of fair criticism will justify; but when he tells us, on the authority of this passage in St. Jude, "that the spirit of prophecy rested on the posterity of Seth," (by which word we presume he means to include others besides Enoch,) and that this is "not merely a supposition resting on probability, but a fact supported by inspired authority of one of the apostolical writers," (p. 33); when he afterwards goes on to quote, as connected with this position, passages from the fragments preserved by Syncellus, we certainly feel ourselves called upon to exercise some circumspection. "*Tot enim in illis,*" said Joseph Scaliger, speaking of these fragments, which he himself first brought to light—"tot enim in illis quorum piget, tædet, pudetque ut nisi scirem Judæorum esse mentiri, neque nunc eos illas nugas desinere posse, ne digna quidem censuissem quæ legerentur." More wretched stuff, than they are, indeed, cannot be conceived.

Having thus stated the difficulties which appear to us to lie in the way of Mr. Nolan's preliminary propositions, we now come to consider the circumstantial evidence which he adduces in support of the preceding hypothesis. As the link of connexion between the premises which he has heretofore been laying down,

and his final proof of the conclusion to which he arrives, is drawn from the prophecy of Balaam, we shall present our readers with his account of this remarkable person. We shall omit the notes, which are long and abstruse, merely observing that they are full of learning and research, and sufficiently warrant all the several points in the history of Balaam, which the author brings forward.

“The fortieth year had nearly expired, after the Israelites had taken their departure from Egypt, and they had reached their last encampment in the plains of Moab, when Balak invited Balaam from Syria, by a special deputation of his nobles, to oppose the new invaders with his enchantments. Of the occupation or country of the seer, whose assistance the King of Moab required, there can be little room for dispute, whatever difficulties have been raised on the subject by those who have investigated his history, or expounded his prediction.

“Balaam is termed by his contemporary, Moses, ‘the son of Beor of Pethor of Mesopotamia;’ or, ‘Syria between the two rivers;’ in which designation he is at once identified as a native Assyrian. Had we been at any loss to ascertain the country of the seer of Pethor, thus clearly defined by its natural boundaries, some light might be attained in discovering its site, from his own representation in declaring, that ‘the King of Moab brought him from Syria, out of the mountains of the east.’ The plains of Mesopotamia are overlooked by the Cordyæan mountains; and both the elevated and plain country were inhabited by Sabians, whose tenets Balaam was instrumental in propagating among the Israelites. His country should be, however, rather sought near the upper Chaldea, which was also mountainous, and was situated to the north of Mesopotamia, which is equally represented, by the oriental traditions, as infested by the Sabian superstitions. In the vicinity of this region, the Greek and Latin writers place some schools of the Chaldee diviners, to one of which they ascribe a name, which may be derived from the Pethor, whence Balaam was designated, with less violence to orthography than has been offered to many oriental terms, avowedly transmitted to us by these writers.

“In determining the profession of Balaam, there exists as little room for doubt, as in ascertaining his country. He is designated in Scripture as ‘Balaam the son of Beor, the soothsayer,’ or diviner. The Chaldean sages have been divided, by the writer who has most accurately described them, into four kinds; of whom the second addicted themselves to the arts of divination; recourse being had to astrology and augury, to obtain an insight into futurity. From an acquired proficiency in these arts, we have authority from Scripture to suppose, that Balaam obtained the repute, and acquired the appellation, of a diviner.

“Nor can his claims to a higher or prophetic character, previously to his entering on his mission to Moab, be supported on the same authority, although he has been termed ‘a prophet’ by the Apostle. In reconciling this title with his designation as ‘a diviner,’ it is unnecessary to suppose, that it has been catachrestically applied, as by another apostle,



from being commonly conferred on the Chaldean seers by the orientals. With that sacred character the Mesopotamian diviner became invested, from the time that he uttered the remarkable prophecy, which he delivered to Balak. On that occasion the Scripture accordingly describes the influence by which he was moved, in terms that are only applicable to those who were divinely inspired, and who possessed the prophetic vision. That he was then visited by an afflation of the divinity, to which he had been previously a stranger, seems to be implied in the influence which it possessed in inducing him to renounce his delusive art: 'he went not, as at other times, to seek for enchantments,' or augury.

"The wisdom of selecting a seer, from the country of diviners, to fill the high office on which Balaam was deputed, is sufficiently apparent, without any laboured illustration: his mission derived advantages from his fame as a soothsayer, which it could scarcely have acquired from his character as a prophet. Had it secured no other object than to give the Israelites the assurance of a diviner, and one the most highly reputed in his art, 'that there was no enchantment against Jacob, neither any divination against Israel,' in attaining this end, its wisdom had been obvious. On the nations existing out of the Jewish pale to whom the prediction of Balaam was addressed, and for whom it was principally intended, its operation was of more obvious importance. From them a more ready assent was obtained to the truths, which Balaam was instrumental in revealing, in consequence of their being delivered by one of their compatriots, whose fame must have been generally diffused, as it extended from Mesopotamia to Moab. In the temporary conversion of so reputed a seer, and the public renunciation of his errors, before the assembled nobles of Midian and Moab, a salutary lesson was inculcated before those nations, upon whose superstition the delusive art which he practised had exercised a tyrannous and degrading influence."—p. 35.

Having thus put his reader in possession of all the particulars that can be collected concerning the person of Balaam, Mr. Nolan next proceeds to an examination of his celebrated prophecy. He first puts it into the Samaritan character, in which it was written originally, and then gives us what he considers as the true translation.

"The saw of Balaam the son of Beor,  
 And the saw of the man whose eye is closed;  
 The saw of him who heard the Word of God,  
 And knew the knowledge of the Highest;  
 Who beheld the vision of the Almighty,  
 Falling [entranced] and being illumined in sight.  
 I shall see Him, but not now;  
 I shall behold Him, but not near.  
 A star shall proceed out of Jacob,  
 A sceptre shall rise out of Israel,  
 And shall break the *Termini* of Moab  
 And destroy all the *Sethites*."—p. 47.

The remainder of the prophecy, in which the Prophet denounces the destruction of Moab, is also given by Mr. Nolan; but as we do not mean to offer any remarks upon his interpretation of this part of the prophecy, in which, according to our author, it is the Assyrians, and not the people of Israel, who are predicted as the future conquerors of Balak's territory—an opinion, we believe, in which he is entirely singular,—we shall confine our attention to those parts of his argument which appear to us as of fundamental importance to his conclusion; in which point of view the two concluding lines of his translation will require to be particularly examined.

The common translation is, “There shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the *children of Sheth*.”—(Numb. xxiv. 17.) Mr. Nolan translates the passage, and “shall break the *Termini* of Moab, and destroy all the *Sethites*.” We shall have to say a few words upon the merits of his translation hereafter, but first of all we must explain the connexion which it holds with the chain of his general argument.

We have already seen that Mr. Nolan is of opinion “that the spirit of prophecy rested upon the posterity of Seth;” and that they had among them an authentic book of Enoch, in which “the coming of the Lord to judgment” was distinctly prophesied. If, then, the posterity of Seth, or the Sethites, mentioned by Epiphanius, were the same as the Sabæans of whom Maimonides speaks, among whom Abraham was educated, and who, according to Mr. Nolan, dwelt in that part of Mesopotamia of which Balaam was a native, as we have just now seen, then the knowledge of a “Great Deliverer,” he argues, existed among the Assyrians. But his proof does not rest here; among the gods of the Assyrians, Isaiah mentions Nebo, in conjunction with Bel. Now Nebo, we are told, was the same as Mercury; but Mercury was represented in the form of a Terminus; when the Prophet, therefore, says “he shall break the *Termini* of Moab,” he is to be understood, says Mr. Nolan, as speaking of the idolatrous images of Nebo, who was worshipped under that form. The question then is, who was Nebo? The name Nebo, he proceeds to tell us, means “The Prophesied,” in other words, the “Great Deliverer,” who, as the prophecy of Enoch informed the Sethites, “was to come to execute judgment, with ten thousand of his saints.”

We pay a most willing tribute of praise to the ingenuity of the argument by which this conclusion is attempted to be established, and would very gladly acquiesce in its truth, if it had been at all borne out by the evidence; but, we fear, there are few of the

steps in the whole reasoning which will bear the test of examination.

We do not pretend to oppose our opinion to that of Mr. Nolan on a mere point of Hebrew criticism; but we have no theory to maintain, and he has,—a disadvantage on his part which certainly diminishes our confidence in his judgment in the particular case before us. He translates the words which in our Bible are given “the children of Sheth,” by the apparently equivalent expression “Sethites.” In support of this deviation he does not say that there is only one word in the Hebrew, nor that our translators have committed a mistake; but he tells us, that for the same reason that “sons of Israel” means “Israelites,” so also “sons of Seth” is synonymous with “Sethites.” But if there be no greater difference, in the meaning which he wishes us to attach to the word “Sethites” and the phrase “sons of Sheth,” than there is between the word “Israelites” and “sons of Israel,” why, we will ask, did Mr. Nolan think it necessary to change the received translation? This last is not only indisputably a literal translation, but is borne out by the Septuagint, and by every commentator without exception. His translation may, indeed, be also right in words; but when we know that under the name Sethites the *idea* to be slipped in is, not “sons of Sheth,” but “*worshippers* of Sheth,” we think our readers will pause before they agree with our author, at least in the present case, that בני שֵׁת, literally “children of Sheth,” means Sethites. It is indeed evident that Mr. Nolan was himself not quite unaware of the concealed sophism couched under his proposed interpretation, for at p. 98 he tells us, that the Prophet could not “be understood literally, as including all the posterity of Seth,” (as all the posterity, however, of Israel were included under the word Israelites,) for that in this case he would have “proscribed the Redeemer himself,” who was a descendant of the Patriarch. No doubt he was, as are all mankind through Noah; and this is the reason why every interpreter, without any exception we believe, has always understood the passage to be equivalent to “all the sons of Adam.” The reader has only to take down the *Critici Sacri*, and he will soon be satisfied how little reason there is for adopting any other interpretation. Let us now examine the reasoning by which Mr. Nolan endeavours to persuade us that the words of the prophecy, which in our translation are rendered “*corners of Moab*,” ought properly to have been translated “*Termini of Moab*.”

After premising that the hills on which Balak directed Balaam to sacrifice were consecrated, probably, to the Assyrian idols,



Peor and Nebo, and that on this last mountain a temple was erected to Chemosh, another of the Moabitish deities, he tells us, "that as an identity is admitted between Peor and Chemosh, and as Nebo is also allowed to have partaken of the common resemblance in which they agreed, we cannot greatly err in supposing that these idols, if not of the same kind, were at least distinguished by the same emblems."—p. 89.

For this opinion Mr. Nolan has the authority of Selden, so far as the identity of Peor and Chemosh is concerned; and we think he has probability on his side in saying that Baal-Peor and Priapus are the same. On what ground he determines that Nebo is the same as Mercury in particular, rather than Apollo or Hercules, or any other heathen god, we must confess, we are somewhat at a loss to understand. He produces the authority of Hyde, not in Peritsol. Synt. Dissert. t.i. p. 53., to show that Mercury was the same as Baal-Peor, but none whatever, that we are able to see, for supposing him to have been Nebo, except that "Priapus and Mercury were both represented in the form of a Terminus" (p. 90); which indeed, if we may believe Faber, Pagan Idol. vol. ii. p. 377—388, was symbolical of other gods as well as those here mentioned. Jupiter Terminalis is said by Diodorus to be the god Terminus, to whom Numa dedicated land-marks; and Hercules Terminus is mentioned by Lucian as one of the Gallic deities. We have made these observations merely to show the great uncertainty which must necessarily hang over all conclusions that depend upon mythological symbols; but as the subject is before us, it may not be amiss to add a few remarks that will further illustrate this part of Mr. Nolan's argument.

Every reader who has taken the trouble of looking at the works of those who have written upon the history of the ancient mythology, is familiar with discussions upon the origin of stone-worship among the heathens. Of its antiquity there is no doubt; it is directly alluded to in the Phenician history of Sanconiathon, and traces of it may be found, in abundance, in the worship of both the Greeks and Romans, as well as of the Egyptians. These sacred emblems, or whatever we are to call them, (for the ancients appear to have supposed them endowed with life, λίθες ἐμψύχες,) were called Baithulia; a name, it is commonly supposed, derived from Jacob's pillar at Bethel (Gen. xxviii. 18). The passage must be familiar to our readers: when the Patriarch awoke out of his vision in the morning, we are told that he exclaimed, "*How dreadful is this place! this is no other than the House of God! And he rose up, took the stone that he had put for his pillow, and set it up for a pillar, and poured oil upon the top of it. And he*

called the name of that place *Beth-el*—which last word literally signifies the “House of God.”

As Sanconiathon mentions Betylos as one of the four sons of Uranus, it may perhaps be slightly doubtful whether the name Baithulia is derived from Beth-el or from the Phenician deity, or, as Mr. Faber thinks, from Bath-ila, which are names of Buddha. The best authorities, and among others Bochart, are in favour of the first derivation; but be this as it may, a very easy explanation is given, we think, by this passage, of the origin of the worship paid to certain supposed sacred stones by the heathen. It appears from the words of Jacob (21, 22), that the stone was set up by him in memorial of the vow which he then made, of dedicating to God a tenth of all that Providence should bless him with. Instances of the same custom, in after times, may be found in Exod. xxiv. 4, and Jos. iv. 5, xxiv. 26; and we think that in Gen. xii. 8, we trace pretty evidently the same religious institution. Jacob says, “This stone which I have set up for a pillar shall be *God's House*,” (v. 22.) an expression which sufficiently marks the sacredness of such consecrated memorials in the eyes of the Patriarch: it not only accounts for the name Betylos or Bethylia, for the word is variously written, but also for the idolatrous worship of which they afterwards became the object. There is not the least reason to suppose that Jacob was the original institutor of this peculiar form of commemorating religious covenants and transactions; nor, consequently, to suppose that such monuments were not numerous among the descendants of the first family of mankind. But the reflection which we wish to draw from this celebrated passage refers to another point.

Mr. Nolan evidently thinks that the worship paid to the Baithulia, was one and the same with the religious veneration of the *Termini* of Mercury. This opinion is, we believe, very commonly received, but we own that we entertain many doubts upon the subject. The reader will find in Witsius (*Egyptiacorum*, lib. ii. c. vii. c. xi.) a long list of passages extracted from various ancient authors, in almost every one of which, it appears that the Baithulia were worshipped not as symbols, but as being themselves divine; and in not one are they supposed to have any relation to the worship of Mercury or Priapus, or of any other particular deity of the Heathens. If from Witsius we turn to Fabricius *Bib. Græca*, lib. i. c. xi. we find a variety of other passages from ancient authors, in which the history of Hermes and of the *hermatu* or *termini* is fully discussed; and in every one of these we find that the writers whom Fabricius quotes all agree in ascribing the origin of them to the ancient custom of inscribing upon stones laws and inventions, and whatever facts or other information it was wished

to hand down to posterity. In this way, it has been said that all that remains to us of the history of primitive antiquity has been preserved; and as Hermes (who is unquestionably the Thoth of the Egyptians,) was supposed to be the god who presided over learning, wherever stones or pillars having inscriptions on them were found, of which the real authors were unknown, they were attributed, by the popular superstition, to Thoth, or Hermes, or Mercury, according to the country in the language of which the inscriptions were written. This point we think may be as clearly demonstrated, as far as authority will reach, as any fact in the whole circle of our knowledge of the early traditions of mankind. If therefore the Baithulia originated in the patriarchal custom of which we have an instance in the passages from the Pentateuch above quoted; they are, we think, most undoubtedly entirely distinct from the *σηλαί* or columnæ attributed to Mercury. By the "Termini of Moab," however, Mr. Nolan evidently understands the Baithulia, that is to say, pillars, such as were erected by Jacob; owing their origin, as we think, to a corruption of the patriarchal Religion, and having nothing whatever to do with the *hermata* of Mercury; on which supposition his translation involves, in our opinion, an historical difficulty, and one of which he was not aware. So strong indeed is our feeling of this difficulty, that supposing the Hebrew word which Mr. Nolan translates *Termini*, really to signify that which the Romans and other western nations understood by the expression, we should at once, and even for no other reason, doubt whether the word had not some sense in the original, the knowledge of which had been lost.

But we are not driven to any such alternative: a very slight inspection of our author's translation will satisfy us that there is no necessity for doubting the propriety of the received version of the passage.

In the first place this remark is obvious. If "Nebo, or his substitute Mercury, was represented by a plain pillar, consecrated by an unction of sacrifice, the common appellation of which was Baithulia," p. 120, and that it is to a pillar of this sort that Balaam alludes in the word which Mr. Nolan translates "Termini," how does it happen that the word *בָּנִי*, which we find in Genesis, xxvii, 18, 22, xxxi. 13, xxxv. 14, and in a great many other places of the Old Testament, and which is *always* used whenever a pillar or Baithulia is mentioned, should in Numb. xxiv. 17. be written *פָּנָף*, *angulus*, *latus*?

Mr. Nolan admits that this is the word which Balaam employs, and that the literal meaning of it is given in our received version; why then is it to be translated *Terminus*? Schleusner tells us that the reason why the Septuagint writers, who are followed by



most interpreters, translate it, τὰς ἀρχηγὰς Μωάβ, *princes of Moab*, is, *nempe angulus exterior ædificii, quia in utrumvis latus prospectus patet, ædificium continet, pro principe, rege vel magnate sumitur.*" This reasoning Mr. Nolan treats with disrespect, approaching to disdain: "the commentators," he says, "are reduced to sad straining to extract the sense of *princes* from the Hebrew word," which, as he fully admits, "according to the literal rendering of the English signifies "corners." He does not, however, affect to say, that any instances can be produced of the meaning which he has affixed, nor that it has any foundation in the Hebrew root. A different sense from his he tells us, "is adopted not only in the Chaldee" but "in the Latin;" the "Syriac also offers a different sense," as likewise "the Samaritan." The "Arabic renders it, *regions*," which is also the sense given to it by "Symmachus." The Septuagint, the Vulgate, and also all the modern versions," agree in thinking differently from our author. All this he admits; the only authority in his favour being that of Pagnini; "who appears to me," he says, "to have expressed more accurately than any of the translators the meaning of this curious passage." We think our readers will smile, at what Mr. Nolan seems to think an approximation to his "*Termini of Moab:*" et transfigo terminos Moab," says Pagnini; and we are to understand, it is to be presumed, that the *only* difference between these translations consists in the slight orthographical variety of spelling the same word with a capital in our author's translation, which Pagnini spells with a small initial. If Pagnini's translation be not exactly *the same* as that of Mr. Nolan's, it is not nearer to it than the received version; for "*borders of Moab*" has at least as little relation to *stone columns*, "as *corners of Moab*."

It will be evident to our readers, from what has been said, that the reasons for substituting "*Termini of Moab*," in the place of "corners of Moab," are founded upon historical considerations and not on philological principles. The real nature of the argument is simply this—I have as much right to say that "corners of Moab" is put for *Termini of Moab*," as the Septuagint and other translators have to say, that it means "*Princes of Moab*." And this is true, perhaps, in one sense; but then Mr. Nolan ought to consider, whether it is quite reasonable on his part, to call upon his readers to adopt his single opinion directly in the face of so many and such high authorities as he himself produces.

We have thought it right to examine at some length this part of Mr. Nolan's book, because it is important that our received version should not be unsettled, except on very sufficient reasons. We now come to the argument which he draws from the general

scope and bearing of Balaam's prophecy; and here we think his hypothesis, at first view, rests upon very tenable ground.

"The possibility being admitted, that a prophecy of Jacob might have made its way among his compatriots, the Assyrians; it may be at once raised to a moral certainty, without adducing further proof but that which presents itself in the document before us. Balaam, it has been observed, was of that nation: his prophecy, however, bears internal evidence, that its author was well acquainted with Jacob's prediction. He not only introduces the patriarch expressly by name, but he imitates his prophecy, in its scope, language, and images. As Jacob professes to inform his sons, of what 'shall befall them in *the last days*;' Balaam undertakes 'to advertise Balak what this people should do to his people, in *the latter days*.' As the one declares that '*the sceptre* should not depart from Judah;' the other declares, that '*a sceptre* should rise out of Israel.' In the prediction of each of them, Judah is not only compared to a lion; but their respective descriptions exhibit a circumstantial coincidence, in the imagery and diction, which places the imitation of the prophet beyond controversion. In the patriarch's description, 'Judah is a lion's whelp—he stooped down, he couched as a lion and as an old lion, who shall rouse him up?' in the prophet's, 'he couched, he lay down, as a lion, and as a great lion, who shall rouse him up?' In fine, the bold figure, in which Balaam opens his prediction, does not merely intimate, that he was acquainted with the prediction of Jacob; but presupposes, that his auditors were familiar with the subject. In mentioning Jacob's name, and particularising '*the latter days*,' and '*the sceptre of Judah*;' the prophecy of the patriarch was brought as unequivocally before his hearers, as if it had been expressly quoted. Nor could it admit of any doubt, who the Personage was to whom the prophet alluded, in declaring,

*I shall see Him, but not now,  
I shall behold Him, but not near:  
A star shall proceed out of Jacob,  
A sceptre shall rise out of Israel.*

That it could be Him only, of whom *Jacob himself* had declared,  
*The Sceptre shall not depart from Judah,  
Nor a ruler from between his feet,  
Until the Pacificator shall come.*—pp. 118, 119.

This passage is drawn up with much force and ability, and if the reader will compare it with the other which we have extracted from p. 35, he will see that in the two, the ground is laid of a very legitimate hypothesis. Balaam was an Assyrian and a soothsayer; he had been sent for by Balak on account of his supposed fatidical character; and he appears to have known not only the history of the people against whom he was commanded to pronounce a curse, but also to have been acquainted, (at least there is room

for the surmise,) with a very remarkable prophecy concerning the great "Promise" of which they were the depositaries. The question is, can any light be thrown, from other quarters, on these presumptive facts, such as to warrant us in asserting that the knowledge of Balaam was not communicated to him on the spot, either by the Moabites or by divine illumination, but was drawn from previous information possessed by him in common with the rest of his nation?

Our author thinks that he has discovered evidence of a very demonstrative kind, in the etymology of the word Nebô or Nabô, one of the Assyrian deities. The word, he tells us, means "the Prophesied;" we shall present our readers with the proof of this, immediately; but, perhaps, it will not be thought irrelevant in this place, to premise, that we should have thought it more fortunate for his argument, had his reasoning been drawn from the signification of the word Baal, or Chemosh, or Ashtarothe, or any other of the more celebrated eastern idols; inasmuch as it is a question, proposed by Vossius, (de Idolat. lib. ii. c. 8.) whether such a deity as Nebô is to be found. Vossius decides in the affirmative, and we have no intention of disputing his decision; but we certainly think the probabilities are very evenly balanced.

The word Nebô occurs in the Old Testament twelve times, as the reader may see by turning to his Concordance. Now in *all these places*, except Isaiah, xlv. 1., it is put for the name of a place, and not of an idol; and in the single passage where it occurs, in this last sense, the Septuagint reads Δαγών. To say that this is a false reading for Ναβαῦ, is obviously to assume the question; Dagon is the reading found in all the MSS., and was in Jerome's copy. The fair presumption is, therefore, either that Dagon, and not Nebô, was the reading of the Hebrew copies, from which the Septuagint was translated; or else that the translators, knowing of no such god as the last, substituted Dagon as a conjectural emendation. The passage of Isaiah is, "*Bel boweth down; Nebô stoopeth; their idols were upon the beasts, and upon the cattle.*" St. Jerome's note upon this passage is "Nabo et ipsum idolum est quod interpretatur *prophetia, divinatio*, quam post evangelii veritatem in toto orbe conticuisse, significat." Vossius, who quotes the commentary, subjoins "quibus et verbis colligo Nebonis *oraculum* consuli solere, atque hinc esse nominis ejus causam." This agrees with Schleusner. "Ναβαῦ. Ipsa vox Hebraica כְּבוֹ, Jer. xv. 2., quam ἐγκαθισμὸν, scil. τῆς προφητείας, interpretantur.

Now although we think it an assumption to say, as Mr. Nolan does, p. 124, that Bel and Nebo were the "*principal gods*" that



were common to the Moabites and Assyrians, yet it would be, we think, to run into the opposite extreme, to affirm that no such god as the last was known to the Septuagint writers. That there is a doubt upon the subject, we certainly hold; but supposing the point to be proved, still we see that in interpreting the word Nabû to mean "the prophesied," we have against us the authorities of St. Jerome, of D. Vossius, and Schleusner, all of whom distinctly understand the word to mean *oraculum*. Mr. Nolan produces no authority except that of Eusebius (of which we shall speak immediately,) in favour of his interpretation; but he does that which in itself is, perhaps, more conclusive: he gives his reasons, drawn from the language itself, for thinking that the proper signification of the word is not *prophecy*, nor the *place* where prophecies were delivered, but, as he says, "The Prophesied."

That the root from which the word is derived means *prophetavit*, is of course admitted; assuming this, his argument is as follows:—

"The name נבּו Nebo, or as it is more properly written Nabô, assumes the epenthetical *vau* in its second syllable; as appears from a collation of its orthography in the oriental languages and the western translations, vid. sup. p. 85. n. 187. The verb נבא or נבי from which it is confessedly derived, and which differ only in the common and accidental change of verbs in Lamed-aleph, *naturally* assumes the epenthetical ו, in the past participle, of which it is the characteristic. From Paul נבוא, *prophesied*, has been formed נבו, Naḅaû, *Nabo*; by rejecting the variable termination, after the analogy of עשו, 'Hsaû, *Esau*, from the past participle, עשוי, of the verb עשה. Thus Pasor derives the latter name; Etyma. Nom. Nov. Test. sub voc. 'Hsaû, *Esau*, nomen viri. origine Hebræum עשו. . . עשו vero dicitur q. d. *factus, perfectus*..a radice עשה, *perfecit*."—p. 108, 109.

From our own knowledge of Hebrew, we should be very unwilling to oppose our opinion to that of Mr. Nolan, upon a point of critical learning; but for the same reason, neither do we dare to adopt Mr. Nolan's opinion, standing as it does, opposed to such high authority; particularly as we have had occasion to observe throughout his book, that he is generally very much too anxious to establish his conclusion to be quite as careful and circumspect as he ought to be in the selection of his proof. We have given an instance or two of this already; and an example of the same grave and serious fault occurs in that part of his argument which we are now considering. We said, just now, that the only authority cited by our author in favour of his etymological conjecture, was Eusebius. The value of this authority in the present instance our readers will be able to appreciate.

One part of Mr. Nolan's object is to establish a connexion

between the character of Nebo and the prophecy of Jacob, concerning the future Shiloh. If Nebô means "the prophesied," and Shiloh means "the prophesied," this would furnish a very happy presumption in favour of the preceding argument; but we must state the point in the words of our author.

"If the coincidence be deemed accidental, it must be admitted to be extraordinary, which subsists between the name ascribed by the Assyrians to this deity, and that assigned, by the most learned expositor of prophecy among the ancients, to the Divine Personage to whom Jacob alludes in his prediction. Eusebius, however, conspires with the Assyrians, not merely in rejecting the term Shiloh, and every title into which that term can be explained; but in adopting a name, which is synonymous with Nebo; as literally signifying 'the prophesied,' or 'the foretold.'"—p. 122.

Mr. Nolan, in his note, then refers to Eusebius, from whom he produces the following passage:—"But what is also said after this, 'A prince shall not fail from Judah, nor a ruler from between his feet, until he for whom it is reserved shall come, and to him shall be the expectation of the nations,' seems to me to allude to the times of the appearance of the *Prophesied*, (*τὰς χροῖνας ἀνιτρίσθαι μοι δοκεῖ τῆς τῆ Προφητευομένης παρθεσίας*)."

The passage here adduced we have not been able to find, owing, probably, to an error in the reference: for this reason it has not been in our power to verify the quotation. But what can Mr. Nolan mean by saying that Eusebius rejects not merely the term Shiloh, "but every title into which that term can be explained?" Eusebius, according to our author's own translation, evidently adopts the Septuagint interpretation; and are we to understand that this is not one of the titles into which the term Shiloh is to be explained? The words of Genesis are quoted by Eusebius, in Dem. Evang. lib. iii. c. 2, from the Septuagint itself—*ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ᾧ ἀπόκειται*. Speaking, indeed, of the promised Messiah, he uses the word *προφητευόμενον*, not once, but very many times: we would have our readers to observe, however, that the word is not written with a capital, as if it had been a proper name—"the foretold," "the prophesied," *τον Προφητευόμενον*. This, unless we are very much deceived, is Mr. Nolan's emendation, justified neither by the context, nor by the genius of the Greek language; nor by the Latin translation either of Robert Stephens, Par. 1544, or of Fr. Vigesus, 1628—*τί δὲ ποτέ ἐμποδὼν μὴ ἐκὶ αὐτόν εἶναι φάσκειν τὸν προφητεύμενον*—*quid ultra jam impedit ne illum esse dicamus de quo Prophetia extant*: again, a little further on, *ἢ εἰναὶ τὸν προφητευόμενον*—*quam is adveniat quem Prophetia significat*.\* The word by which Eusebius paraphrases the

\* Euseb. Dem. Evang. lib. iii. c. 2.

particular expression of the Septuagint, in the place just quoted, happens to be, not *προφητεύομενον*, but *προσδοκωμένον*: is this also to be written *Προσδοκωμένον*, with a capital, and translated "the Expected?" The case is the stronger against Mr. Nolan, inasmuch as wherever Eusebius talks of "the Prophets," a capital letter is always employed by him; and we may be quite sure that had he used the word "prophesied" substantively, as the title of the Messiah, he would have marked his meaning by a similar mode of writing. As the whole wonder of "the extraordinary coincidence" which our author discovers between his opinion and that of Eusebius, is founded upon what we suppose to be a mere fanciful invention, the curiosity of it will probably not seem so striking to the reader as it does to Mr. Nolan. Neither in this instance, nor in the instance before, of Pagnini's "Termini," do we think that any advantage was to be gained in the argument at all worth the risk of the contrivance, supposing the stratagem to have been used consciously and by design; and, therefore, we quite acquit our excellent author of every suspicion of the kind.

It is said of mathematical studies, that they unfit the mind for the perception of all evidence that is not demonstrative: just the reverse of this appears to be the effect of etymological pursuits; they enable a person to see demonstrative certainty, when the bystanders can see nothing but the merest shadow of an abstract possibility. It was thus that the excellent and truly learned author of the "Origin of Pagan Idolatry" very gravely conjectured that "Robin Hood and his maid Marian" were mere popular transmutations of Buddha and his wife Maya. And Bryant, *venerabile nomen*, having to show that Babel came from Bel, and Babylon from Babel, tells us that the "Confusion of Languages" was not, properly speaking, a "*confusion* of speech," but a "*previation* of tongue;" so that when the builders of the Tower meant to say Bel, some stuttered out Ba-al, others Ba-bel, and others again, Ba-by-lon, which last word finally prevailed as the name of the city, where the town of Bel was built. These examples are more than sufficient to shield Mr. Nolan from disrespect, or any severity of criticism, on account of some flights which otherwise might seem to be too adventurous in two or three of his etymological speculations. The conclusion which he has aimed at establishing remains, we think, pretty much where it was before his book was written; but the undertaking itself has merit in the conception, not only as being favourable to revelation, but as marking originality of genius. It has failed, because the proposition to be demonstrated, whether true or false, is not capable, as we think, of proof either way, from the absence of documents. Had the evidence for it existed, we have no doubt that Mr. Nolan's learn-



ing and ingenuity would have been successful in discovering it: as it is, the fault of his book (and, to speak truly, a great fault it is) proceeds from his having attempted to prove more than his materials warranted him in undertaking.

We now take our leave of this elaborate work. There are some subsidiary arguments produced by the author in support of the several points which we have been examining, but which we have passed over, because the propositions themselves being shown not to have a solid foundation, the mere props by which they were strengthened lose their importance. One topic, of a more independent kind, which Mr. Nolan treats at some length, and to which it may be proper to advert, is the tradition that prevailed among the ancient astronomers, or rather astrologers, of some great Restitution, or mundane Regeneration, of which the fourth millennium of the world was to be the era. All that we can say on this point is, that if Balaam, or the ancient Assyrians, expected a "Deliverer" to appear at the period of the world when our Saviour was born, (A. M. 4004,) this expectation could not be founded upon the tradition of prophecy; for the Jews themselves, until the time of Daniel, were left entirely in the dark as to the period when the Messiah was to appear. If founded on any other presumption, (such as the fables of the Chaldee astrologers, for example,) the investigation of its origin has no proper connexion with "The Assyrian Expectations of a Great Deliverer."

ART. XII.—*Lux Renata: a Protestant's Epistle, with Notes.*

By the Author of *Religio Clerici*. London. Mawman and Rivingtons. 1827. Svo. 4s. 6d.

NOT many years ago there might have been some reason to believe, that according to the homely allegory of honest John Bunyan, Giant Pope sat bedridden by the side of his deceased friend, Giant Pagan, gnashing his few remaining teeth at the pilgrims as they passed in safety, near his cave. It should seem, however, that, like the treacherous and crawling snake,

"Positis novus exuviis, nitidusque juvenâ,"

the reverend senior has renewed his youth in the sunshine of peace, and is creeping about anew, and erecting his crest in search of mischief. Not to dwell upon the circumstances of our own internal history, it is proved amply by the paltry and vexatious tyranny of the Roman see in its domestic regulations, the growing influence and machinations of the bigots and Jesuits of France;

and the detestable atrocities\* dragged to light from the dens of the Spanish Inquisition within these seven years, that the spirit of Popery, according to its own motto, is still "semper eadem," and its system of aggression and imposition in full activity. None can attempt to deny that, in the dark ages, its evil was counter-balanced by an equal proportion of good. If with a curious felicity it united the discrepant characteristics of superstitions differing in time and place, if it combined the bootless self-torments and sanctimonious nastiness of the Faquirs and Yoguees, with the human† sacrifices of the Druids, and the pompous mummeries of the classical pagans, (adopted with little or no alteration by the same plastic fiat which turned the Capitoline Jupiter into the Apostle Peter,) it possessed also most of the merits of these respective modes of faith; the zeal of one, the munificence of another, and the brilliancy with which imagination and the arts had invested a third. If in one kingdom alone, thirty-five thousand victims were at different periods burnt alive in honour of the triple-crowned Moloch, the fear of him might also act as a salutary restraint on the secular tyrants to whose warlike propensities such a number of lives would have been but as a mouthful. If Catholicism imposed an oppressive yoke on more tender consciences, it afforded "a bridle for the ass, and a rod for the fool's back." Its task is, however, fairly done, and its day past; and it may be confidently hoped that the present struggles to revive its spirit and maintain its authority are symptoms of approaching dissolution; or, to eke out John Bunyan's similitude by a Scottish phrase, that the giant is "gaun fey." Whether this hope be or be not well-founded, and whether or not the legislature may continue to do its duty as it hitherto has done, it is gratifying to reflect that the Church of England rests on a firmer basis than mere secular authority, that the spirit of the serious and enlightened part of the English nation is awakened to the temporal and spiritual blessings obtained for them by their forefathers, and the precious nature of the deposit with which they are entrusted; that the names of our "noble army of Martyrs" are now "familiar in our mouths as household words;" and that so many men of talent, laic as well as clerical, stand boldly forward to give a reason for the faith which is in them, and court the test of truth and Scripture for their Church, that her deeds may be made manifest. This Mr. Southey has most triumphantly done on a more extended scale than that professed by the author of the poem now

\* See Llorente's History of the Inquisition, relative to the punishment of the pendulum, in 1820, &c.

† See Llorente's description of the Quemadero, and the gigantic images of the four Apostles, devoted to the same purpose as the more fragile wicker fabrics of the Druids.

under our notice; who nevertheless, in modestly professing to follow his steps, has illustrated the subject by a vein of vivid imagination and powerful satire; and as his notes will show, has condensed in a poem of between six and seven hundred lines, the pith and marrow of much research in books not generally known.

We must however beg to differ from him in the outset, on his own principle of giving truth fair play and an open field. Agreeing with him as we do, that half an education is worse than none at all, we still anticipate much good and little evil from the inquiring spirit recently awakened among the "lettered rabble," as he unceremoniously styles the better-informed part of the labouring community. As long as the love of relaxation and good beer is natural to man, and Saint Monday continues to occupy a place in the mechanic's calendar, there is strong reason to be sceptical as to any danger of being overrun with Gregorys, Burns's, and Arkwrights, a danger, which one would wish to see existing in reality. But if the spirit in question be alive and effective to any extent, it is both the duty and interest of the privileged orders to rescue their countrymen from the hands of quacks and demagogues, and instead of grudging them the half-education which their limited opportunities allow them to acquire, afford them every facility towards the attainment of a whole one. The ignorance and self-conceit which tend to render men bad Christians, and bad subjects, are best corrected by knowledge sufficient to enable them to appreciate a religion and a social system which triumphantly court the test of inquiry. The only fear is, that they should not know enough.—But a truce to our truisms, and let us follow the main argument of the author, who probably means nothing more than a passing gibe on Dr. Birkbeck's project in its present tadpole state of existence.

Without meddling with the political part of the Roman Catholic question, he proposes to submit the vital principle of Catholicism itself to the test of reason and history:—

"Behold Rome creep along her tangled way,  
To-morrow teaching all she taught to-day:  
Through the same maze her trodden steps renew,  
Still unprogressive, for without a clue.  
Confute her doctrines; spite of all your pain,  
Their ghosts are never laid, but walk again.  
Sever one head; a thousand added grin:  
O'erthrow her; keener must the strife begin:  
The touch of kindred Earth new strength supplies,  
But hold her up to Heaven, the Monster dies."—pp. 53, 54.

In describing the first usurpations of this corrupt branch of the true Catholic Church, he rather bewilders his meaning by follow-



ing Astolfo into the obscure regions of the moon to consult Constantine's pretended charter. Anon, however, he speaks out rather more roundly, and to the purpose:—

“ Much power by Fraud, by Terror more was gained,  
This Guilt accorded, Falsehood that obtained.  
With lavish hand both Saint and Sinner gave,  
One stung by conscience, one to zeal a slave.  
Till the proud Harlot, from her seven-fold hill,  
Saw prostrate Nations cower beneath her will;  
And his broad arms the peaceful Fisher threw,  
More wide, AUGUSTUS, than thine Eagles flew.”—p. 13.

The galling humiliation sustained by the Emperor Henry IV., the “ in-and-in breeding” of pontiffs in the days of the Theodoras and Marozias, (if one may apply a harmless agricultural term to the propagation of human brutes,) and the memorable boutade of Julius II. are touched upon each in its turn, in spirited lines which vary their character as the subject varies: and the author proceeds in a stately march of verse descriptive or vituperative, till

“ — the red Idol mounts his guilty state.  
Upborn by Murder, Avarice, Lust, and Hate.”—p. 21.

Anticipating next the fancied vindication of Papacy, which some liberal might found upon “ Leo's golden days,” he retorts,

“ Thanks for that name ! Hail days indeed of gold,  
Days when Salvation's scrip was bought and sold.”—p. 23.

Now though Leo is rather to be considered as a secular Mæcenas than as a pope, and probably cared as little as Gallio for any question vitally connected with the Catholic faith, yet the opportunity of giving what the fencers call a “ time-thrust” to the supposed argument, is too tempting to be neglected.

The shameless traffic of Tetzal and his gang, still perpetuated in rather a modified shape at the pontifical bazaar, is ably described as tolerated by Leo X. and as opening the eyes of Luther in “ the Goshen of his cell.” The limits of the author's design would perhaps hardly have admitted of an eulogy on the earlier and purer Goshen, existing in the fastnesses of the Alps and Pyrennees; but we should have been better pleased had he devoted a few lines to the commemoration of our own glorious Wicliffe,\* to whom Luther may be traced in a direct line of

\* It has been well observed by Mr. Southey, that “ it is a reproach to this country that no statue should have been erected in Wicliffe's honour, and that his translation of the Old Testament should never have been printed.” A recent journal has suggested, that the tree celebrated as Wicliffe's Oak, is still standing near Chertsey, in a situation where a new Church would prove a desirable accommodation. If so, we trust the hint will not be wholly lost.

spiritual ancestry. The triumphant life, and peaceful death of the English apostle might have been dwelt upon, (we have no translation of *ευδαιμονίζειν* any more than of *ευθανασία*), as contrasted with the evil days which his disciples had to encounter, and the fate of Lord Cobham. To Wicliffe might have been equally applied, the following lines on Luther :—

“ Then rose the Warrior, girt his loins with might,  
And proved his harness ere he sought the fight :  
Truth nerved his breast, his feet the Gospel shod,  
Faith was his shield, his sword the Word of God.  
Weak against these was Rome’s infuriate train,  
And Councils thundered, Cæsars raged in vain.”—p. 24.

We can do no less than quote at length the passage in which the author, with a spirit of candid discrimination, assigns to Henry the Eighth his due estimation as an unworthy instrument in the hands of an overruling Providence, and while he laments over the incalculable loss which learning and the arts sustained in the wanton demolition of the monasteries of this kingdom, affords them due praise as storehouses of effective charity.

“ Thanks for another name, which teaches more,  
Than all the Virtues History has in store :  
Shews how the hands which Nature’s beam control  
Adjust her balance fitly for the whole :  
Draw balm from poison, Good sublime from Ill,  
And dross from Gold transmute with Chemic skill.  
Mysterious agency ! ‘ Free-will is mine,  
‘ I cast the seed,’ Man cries, ‘ and I design !’  
Cast as you may, a mightier power bestows  
The seed’s increase, and reaps it in the close.

“ For what but Heaven itself to goodly end  
The tyrant HENRY’S hard-ruled course could bend ?  
Or bid an ever-during Temple stand  
Based, not on rock, but Passion’s fleeting sand ?  
O ! pause awhile where Taste and Learning weep  
Above some stately Cloyster’s shattered heap :  
O’er Art’s rich stores hurled rudely to decay,  
And lettered wealth to Ignorance a prey.  
Mourn too with Charity, a holier name,  
Mourn those who fed the hungry, nursed the lame ;  
Toiled not themselves, but willing need employed ;  
The drones are scattered, but the Hive destroyed.  
Mark yet one sad and more domestic scene,  
A widowed Consort, a disceptred Queen !  
See Law to lawless rage her code adjust,  
And pandering Conscience hold the masque to Lust !  
Yet, when the greatest stroke of Fortune fell,  
No gusts of anger in her breast rebel :

Tones of affection through her sorrow's ring;  
 'Tis ' my dear Lord, my husband, and my King!  
 And on her lips the latest vows expire  
 For Him whom ' more than all' her ' eyes desire.' "

pp. 24--29.

The subsequent description (from page 30 to 34) of the gradual progress of Gospel truth, will be found inferior to no part of the poem in vigour and imagery; it is, however, rather too long to quote as a whole within our prescribed limits. Due honour is next paid to Edward the Sixth, the Marcellus of newly-reformed England; and a monarch who would probably have rivalled Alfred, had it pleased Heaven to continue his life. Feeling, like that royal sage and patriot, that his days were numbered by mortal disease, and remembering " that the night was coming in which no man might work," Edward seems anxiously to have crowded the labours and charities of a long life into the short span of a few sickly years. We subjoin at length the contrast between the royal children of Catharine and of Jane Seymour.

" O ! lost too early, blessed beyond thine age,  
 Prince, Patriot, Saint, and Statesman, Child and Sage!  
 In Thee, Prophetic rapture so foretold,  
 Sucklings and Babes, the power of God unfold:  
 From beardless lips rich strains of Wisdom flow,  
 Unknown to hoary heads and locks of snow.  
 Though Death, the canker, eat into thy Spring,  
 Long before ripening Suns the promise bring,  
 How rich the fragrance which, ere Being fails,  
 From the crushed blossom Piety exhales!  
 In yonder guardian walls, fair nurse of Youth,  
 Who first bade Science minister to Truth?  
 Who poured the balm, the pillow smoothed, in those  
 Where Pain, no longer hopeless, meets repose?  
 Who whispered mercy to the Soul's despair,  
 And oped yon gates for penitence and prayer?  
 Go, count what centuries of conquest weigh,  
 Poised with the few brief years of EDWARD'S sway!

" Yet not for Thee, blessed Shade! must tears be shed,  
 Fair flower, transplanted to a fitter bed!  
 Weep we for those who cheerlessly remain  
 While Night encompasses their Ark again:  
 And, mocked by visionary Hope's decay,  
 Gaze on the track of Glory pass'd away.  
 What scroll is red enough for MARY'S name?  
 What characters must write it?—Blood and Flame!  
 With Faith which purged not, but perplexed the sight,  
 Too much false Learning ever to be right;



Sufficient Zeal Life's charities to stem,  
 Not to a heavenward channel pilot them;  
 With just enough of mother-wit and skill,  
 To harden, not correct ungoverned will;  
 All Woman's weakness, but that gentle part  
 Fitter than Reason's strength to sway the Heart;  
 Stern, selfish, melancholy, stubborn, slow,  
 Who never spared, nor ever felt a blow.  
 Without one failing of a generous mind,  
 Which Love may fetter or Ambition blind;  
 One touch of fiery-mettled mood, to plead  
 The stings of Passion for some headlong deed;  
 A nice precision in degrees of Hate,  
 And strict the account of Blood to calculate;  
 By Rule She butchered, and arranged the stake,  
 As her Creed prompted her, for Conscience sake.  
 Scanned by her blindness, God himself appears  
 Not Love's perfection, but the source of Fears:  
 In wrath, not pity, the Redeemer dies,  
 And Mercy yields her place to Sacrifice.  
 Hence the grim Priestess fancied merit claims  
 As each new victim gluts the atoning flames;  
 And, while the accursed holocausts ascend,  
 Sees Christ, like Moloch, to the banquet bend."—pp. 34—39.

This we think by no means too strong, in opposition to the generally sound maxim of "*de mortuis*," &c. The obstinate and bitter temperament, and the bad qualities of a true Spaniard, appear to have existed in Mary without any alloy of her mother's virtues, or the high-minded and redeeming qualities which characterize her mother's nation. Like the beloved Ferdinand, she derived no wholesome lesson from the early domestic persecution which thwarted and soured her spirit; and as long as one of the same poisonous brood of tyrants and bigots shall exist, her memory ought to be periodically gibbeted in effigy, and cursed "by candle, book and bell," according to due form.

A spirited eulogy on the Martyrs of our Church, during the Marian persecution, and a triumphant description of the final establishment of the Reformed Protestant Religion in England, bring the historical part of the poem down to the time of the Stuarts. A parallel is drawn between the two Charleses, in which the "merry monarch," as it is the fashion to call him, meets with as just reprobation as Henry VIII.

"Behold, the apostate in his shroud, expire,  
 False to Himself, his Country, and his Sire!  
 Strange fraud! to live without a God, yet die  
 Proving e'en this ungodliness a lie."—pp. 47, 48.

In describing the brief ascendancy of Popery during the reign of James II., and the desirable consummation of things to which it speedily led, the author fails not to do justice to the conscientious and independent course steered by Sancroft and his colleagues, the nonjuring Bishops. "We look in vain throughout history," he justly remarks, "for conduct of more disinterested purity;" in truth, no event ever happened reflecting more real dignity on the character of the English Church than the resignation of the five prelates, which we cannot agree with him in styling "a fall."

Having now brought the historical part of his argument to a conclusion, the author sums it thus up—

"So 'mid each change of good and evil days,  
Dishonour, glory, persecution, praise,  
Whose zeal no triumph slackened, toil dismayed,  
Our Sires, in Christ, their goodly platform laid:  
And bade their Sons an easier task fulfil,  
To guard the rich inheritance from ill.  
Is History blank then? long Experience vain?  
Has this rough path been trodden without gain?  
Draw we no wisdom from the speaking past?  
No glance of foresight to the future cast?  
Shall all our Temple's glory pass away,  
The Rock of Ages shattered in a day?  
And while the hot assail, the subtle mine,  
Our strength shall drivelling apathy resign?"—p. 52.

Showing next the unchanged nature of the doctrines of the Romish Church, in her present curtailed state of secular power, he gives their due meed to two different classes of her advocates. The Bullaboo, or potatoe, school of eloquence, is laughably described, and the following wholesome caution given to the more virulent of its professors, who cry up their own proposed advancement as the universal nostrum which is to feed and breech their rack-rented countrymen, and cure every other possible ill and grievance which affects, or may affect, the sister isle.

—————"but if stern Hate invade  
The couch where suffering and disease are laid;  
If factious Malice blast with evil eyes  
A Prince for whom a Nation's vows arise;  
(Alas! ere finished is the Poet's strain,  
A Nation's eager vows arise in vain.)  
His shield of weakness from the Fool is torn,  
We loathe the reptile whom we did but scorn.  
Unchecked, the Zany may his stage ascend,  
Display his antics, and his nostrums vend;  
One pauucea deal for every pang;  
But, if the wretch mix poison,—he must hang!"—pp. 55, 56.

The unfortunate remnant are treated with but little ceremony,

“ We pass the rest, a nameless, nibbling fry,  
Spawnd but to vent their little dirt, and die.”

Not so nameless, perhaps; but that the noble triton of the fry, callous as a stock-fish to rebuff or castigation, (though unhappily not so dumb,) cannot be specified without a breach of privilege. Probably also the whole of the Blue and Yellow corps, with that fatally-marked personage,

“ The decent priest, where monkies were the gods,”

may be included under this sweeping clause, which however pays rather too great a compliment to the historian in styling him “ Leviathan the Great.”

In the conclusion, the author displays what we think is his characteristic forte; the power of passing at once from the satirical vein into a stately and harmonious march of verse, answerable to the dignity of his subject.

“ True to ourselves, (may Heaven still guard us so,  
Unharm'd by specious friend, or open foe!)  
Our Ark her charge of holiness may guide  
Amid these monsters which beset her side.  
From Earth's abyss, though gushing founts arise,  
Though Vengeance ope the floodgates of the Skies;  
She rides triumphant; while, for many a rood,  
Extinct, around her, floats the Giant brood.  
And mark, when once again the waters shrink,  
And the great deeps, in thirsty channel, drink,  
How, moored on Ararat's unshattered crest,  
Her keel shall find its solitary rest.  
Thence issue forth, Physicians of the Mind,  
The Heaven-taught Teachers of renewed Mankind;  
From darkling Nations purge their Moral Night,  
And bear abroad God's UNEXTINGUISHED LIGHT.”—pp. 62, 63.

As our pen is on the present occasion guided by a lay hand, we cannot be suspected of professional partiality in doing the author the justice which he deserves as a writer, a clergyman, and a gentleman. His talent for pointed and vigorous satire, which we fancy will not be disputed, is rather directed against tenets and measures, than men; and though leading him into personality in one well-deserved instance, appears in no case to be abused to the gratification of private pique and rancour. If at the first glance, some sacred subjects should seem to be somewhat uncere- moniously treated, no candid person will suspect the author of a tendency to levity or indecorum: and though in his zeal he ap-



pears to snatch the sacred ark roughly from profane hands, he shows in the next moment, that he can himself bear it with due reverence and dignity.

Of his style we approve as much as of his matter. The standard English couplet, which he wields with the ease of a practised hand, has of late fallen much into disuse, partly perhaps from the chilling example of dull didactics, partly from the brilliant success of the romantic school of Poetry, and partly from the originality affected by succeeding generations of songsters. In the present state of the times, it is difficult to say what may or may not be considered as verse, which even in some not unpopular works, hops and flounders about with the gait of a mutilated frog. We are therefore pleased to see that there are persons among us who prefer shooting in the bow of Ulysses, or as we may rather call it without danger of misinterpretation, the old British long-bow; handed down from Chaucer to Dryden and Pope; and though easy to play with in mock contest, requiring a nervous arm to draw it to the arrow head with effect. We need not remark with what tremendous practical effect it has been employed by Pope and Gifford, Churchill and Byron; by the two latter sometimes in fair contest, sometimes in merciless random shots. We shall leave our readers to judge whether the author of *Lux Renata* has not drawn this weapon to the head with kindred vigour, and at all events in a worthier and higher cause.

---

ART. XIII.—*The Lord Mayor's Visit to Oxford, in the Month of July, 1826.* Written at the desire of the Party, by the Chaplain to the Mayoralty. London. Longman & Co. 1826. Post 8vo. ,

FEW more splendid exhibitions of successful enterprize have been displayed in the History of Mankind, than that mighty Civic peregrination, which has immortalized the memory of the late excellent Chief Magistrate of London, and has been accurately recorded in the little volume before us, by his faithful spiritual adviser. The State voyages of the *Prætor Urbanus*, hitherto, have been circumscribed between Blackfriars and Westminster; from the former of which, he has been used to embark, in the glory of incipient sovereignty, amid the vociferous shouts of light-hearted apprentices, rejoicing in their holiday, and the solemn aspirations of more sober Common-councilmen, whose dinners depended upon the safety and punctuality of his return. Or, yet farther, under the

clear blue sky of Summer, his gilded vessel has glided in gallant trim, the Water-Bailiff at the helm and a carved Triton at the prow, over smooth and unruffled shallows, to the Thule of the Twickenham meadows, by the banks of which the *Maria Wood* is 'laid up in *Ordinary*. But the labours of Francklin and of Parry have not been lost upon the enlightened Citizens of London. Fired with the strong contagion of discovery, they have conceived and executed an expedition, both by water and on *Terra firma*; and have extended to a far wider range than Pope contemplated when he sang them, their Cimon-like triumphs "over land and wave." One has filled the Civic throne who has ridden, in his private State carriage, from the Mansion House to the Town Hall at Oxford; and has been rowed back again, in his public State barge, on the bosom of the Thames, in all the majesty and magnificence of a Fluviatile and Potamophilous Lord Mayor.

Happily such energy has met its due reward; and it will not be lost to posterity, *caret quia Vate SACRO*. The Chaplain of the Mayoralty has accepted the office of Historiographer; and he has performed its duties to admiration. Never yet did there exist any Annalist, who so fully comprehended the scope of the subject which he was destined to record, or who, in all respects, possessed talents so nicely adapted to its correct representation. Most unfeignedly do we rejoice that his Ministerial calling permits us to include his Work within the pale of our exclusive criticism; and we can assure those readers who are least inclined to deviate from the strict course of Theological study, in the words of the judicious Chaplain himself, that although this "species of writing is not altogether in accordance with the sacred profession of which the writer is the unworthiest member," yet that, not any thing will he found in his pages "at all injurious to the interests of Piety."

Some persons indeed may imagine that it would not have been easy so to frame this narrative as that Piety, in any way, should suffer from it. But this is not our concern; and Mr. Chaplain Dillon can himself judge better of his powers and opportunities of offence, than we can do for him. In order to keep on the safe side, we shall offer as much of his narrative as we can, precisely in his own language.

Early in 1826, it had been determined to connect the assertion of the Lord Mayor's prerogative, as Conservator of the River Thames, as far as the City Stone, near Staines, with an Excursion to Oxford. The train of ideas which led to this not very obvious association is no where explained: perhaps it might arise from the words "London" and "University" having, of late, crept

closer than usual together. Scarcely had this resolution been finally agreed to, before Fame, with her myriad tongues, bruited it abroad at Oxford; and a pleasing embarrassment was created between the two Corporations, by the ardour of rival hospitality—but at length the preliminary Gastronomic arrangements were satisfactorily completed, and it was agreed, after an interchange of deipno-diplomatic correspondence, which Mr. Dillon has printed verbatim, that the Lord Mayor of London and his suite should dine with the Mayor and Magistrates of Oxford on the 25th of July, and that the Mayor and Magistrates of Oxford should dine with the Lord Mayor of London on the following day.

*Di immortales!*

*Quanta pernis pestis veniet! quanta labe larido!*

*Quanta summi absumedo! quanta callo calamitas!*

*Quanta laniis lassitudo! quanta porcinariis!*

On the memorable 25th of July, the Progress accordingly began. Mr. Alderman Atkins, accompanied by two of his daughters, Miss Atkins and Miss Sarah Jane, left his seat, Halstead Place, in Kent, for London on the preceding evening, and set off in the cool of the following morning for Oxford. On the same day Mr. Alderman and Mrs. Lucas, with their daughters Miss Charlotte and Miss Catherine, left their house, at Lea, in Kent, and went by land to Boulter's Lock, near Maidenhead, where they embarked on board the Navigation shallop for Reading; whence their carriage conveyed them the remainder of their journey. For the Great Magistrate himself thus speaks his official Chronicler.

“The private state-carriage, drawn by four beautiful bays, had driven to the door at half-past seven. The coachman's countenance was reserved and thoughtful; indicating full consciousness of the test by which his equestrian skill would this day be tried, in having the undivided charge of four high-spirited and stately horses,—a circumstance somewhat unusual; for, in the Lord Mayor's carriage, a postilion usually guides the first pair of horses. These fine animals were in admirable condition for the journey. Having been allowed a previous day of unbroken rest, they were quite impatient of delay; and chafed and champed exceedingly on the bits by which their impetuosity was restrained.

“The murmur of expectation, which had lasted for more than half an hour, amongst the crowd who had gathered around the carriage, was at length hushed by the opening of the hall-door. The Lord Mayor had been filling up this interval with instructions to the *femme de ménage*, and other household officers, who were to be left in residence, to attend, with their wonted fidelity and diligence, to their respective departments of service during his absence, and now appeared at the door. His Lordship was accompanied by the Lady Mayoress, and followed by the Chaplain.



"As soon as the female attendant of the Lady Mayoress had taken her seat, dressed with becoming neatness, at the side of the well-looking coachman, the carriage drove away; not however, with that violent and extreme rapidity, which rather astounds than gratifies the beholders; but at that steady and majestic pace, which is always an indication of real greatness.

"Passing along Cheapside, and Fleet Street,—those arteries, as Dr. Johnson somewhere styles them, through which pours the full tide of London population,—and then along the Strand and Piccadilly, the carriage took the Henley road to Oxford.

"The weather was delightful; the sun, as though it had been refreshed by the copious and seasonable showers that had fallen very recently, seemed to rise more bright and clear than usual, and streamed in full glory all around. The dust of almost a whole summer had been laid by the rain; the roads were, of consequence, in excellent order; and the whole face of creation gleamed with joy."—pp. 11—13.

As the Civic party approached Hounslow, an explosion took place at the Powder Mills, upon which Mr. Dillon, not unaptly, moralizes. When they reached Cranford Bridge "which is about thirteen miles from Hyde Park Corner," another portion of the party arrived there simultaneously in a chaise; after an interchange of salutations, the Lady Mayoress, observing that they must be somewhat crowded, invited one of them to occupy the fourth seat in her own carriage, "as the day was beginning to be warm, this courteous offer of her Ladyship was readily accepted."

At a quarter past three Oxford was in view, and Mr. Dillon describes his own feelings on entering that city. "You feel," he says—but we must pass on from sentiment to action. A deputation awaited the Lord Mayor at the Star Inn, "congratulating themselves" (and doubtless *him* also) "that only another hour lay between them" and "dinner." At a quarter before seven (a somewhat long single *hour* for hope deferred) the company, five-and-twenty in number, sat down "to a banquet of such a grand and costly nature, as seemed to indicate that the whole neighbouring country had been put in requisition." The Grace cup passed—appropriate Toasts were given—Speeches were made, from one of which we apprehend that Mr. Dillon's Work will provoke a generous emulation on the part of his Hosts: for the Town Clerk of Oxford, in returning thanks for the honour which the company had done him in drinking his health, said that "if it ever fell to his province to write a History of the City of Oxford, he should record the occurrence of this day as an epoch in its annals." This registry of great events by the respective agents of the different leaders concerned in them, is not without the authority of high precedent. When the two Monarchs of England and France met on the Field of Cloth of Gold, at Ardres, Francis,

on the one part, commanded Monsieur Peyresc to compose a Journal of the interview, while Henry, on the other, committed a similar task to the pen of Hall his Recorder.

It was nearly midnight before the company separated. The Chief Magistrate of Oxford throughout the evening manifested that "easy politeness which in an instant supersedes the preliminaries of previous acquaintance, and seems scarcely to require intercourse to strengthen or time to improve it;" and the conversation

"in the intervals of the several Toasts, though naturally of a desultory and general nature, was yet such as to show that good taste, good feeling, and good sense, are by no means limited" (as Mr. Dillon appears before that to have believed) "to the Citizens of the Metropolis."

The following morning commenced with a breakfast, upon which, it is evident, that Mr. Dillon yet lingers with a longing look of recollection;

"the tea and coffee," he remarks, "were accompanied not only with bread, warm and cold, in the shape of loaves, cakes and biscuits, with other varieties, and butter," (shade of Lord Ogleby! 'Hot rolls and butter in the month of July!') "but with every delicacy with which the morning meal, when sumptuously provided, is usually furnished."

The party then proceeded to *lionize*, under the pilotage of the Master of Pembroke Hall. The Kitchen at Christ Church, very naturally, was an object of strong attraction; but it appears to have disappointed expectation; save only so far as regards

"a large old curious gridiron, apparently about four feet square, used in former times for dressing whole joints, before ranges and spits were invented."

In the Theatre of Anatomy they received higher gratification. Professor Kidd (than whom an abler and a better man does not exist) exhibited a series of preparations "so elegantly constructed as in no degree to offend the delicacy of the most refined female;" and among the first which he offered for inspection, "was a portion of the alimentary canal of the Turtle." We cannot sufficiently admire the nicety of tact which thus almost instinctively accommodated things to persons. The learned Professor would not have sought to detain any but Testudinivorous visitors from viewing the other wonders in his seat of the Muses, by venturing *Χελώνην Πηγάσφ συγχρίνειν*.

Dr. Kidd very liberally concluded by repeating, gratuitously, that which (as far as we can judge from Mr. Dillon's report of it) is his Second Lecture on Comparative Anatomy. After this the party, jaded and hungry, in consequence of the long interval

which had elapsed since breakfast, returned to luncheon. The tour of curiosities, however, was renewed, by such as were not too weary, at the close of this "intermediate repast," and continued until the near approach of the dinner hour warned them to make becoming alteration in their dress.

"The hour of six had scarcely arrived, when the company, invited by the Lord Mayor to dine with him at the Star, began to assemble. The city watermen, in their new scarlet state liveries, were stationed in the entrance hall; and a band of music was in attendance, to play on the arrival of the visitors. In a large drawing-room, on the first floor, fronting the street, on a sofa at the upper end, sat the Lady Mayoress, accompanied by Mrs. Charles Venables, and surrounded by the other ladies of the party. The City Marshal of London, Mr. Cope, dressed in full uniform, and carrying his staff of office in his hand, took his station at the door, and announced the names of the guests as they severally arrived. Near the entrance of the room also stood Mr. Beddome, in a richly wrought black silk gown, carrying the sword downwards. The Lord Mayor, who was in full dress, and attended by his chaplain in clerical robes, wore on this occasion the brilliant collar of S.S;—an honour belonging to the Lord High Chancellor,—the Lord Chief Justice of England,—and to the Chief Magistrate of London."—pp. 58, 59.

"When dinner was announced, the party, amounting to nearly sixty persons, each gentleman taking charge of a fair partner, descended to a long room on the ground floor."—p. 61.

"When the Chaplain, by craving a blessing on the feast, had set the guests at liberty to address themselves to the dainties before them; and the room was illuminated throughout by a profusion of delicate wax candles, which cast a light as of broad day over the apartment; it would not have been easy for any eye, however accustomed to look on splendour, not to have been delighted, in no common manner, with the elegance of the classic and civic scene now exhibited in the dining-parlour of the first inn in Oxford."—pp. 62, 63.

"The conversation naturally assumed that tone best qualified for the discovery of those talents and learning, of which the evening had drawn together so select and bright a constellation."—p. 63.

"The ladies, who, to the great gratification of the company, had sat longer than is usual at most tables, at length obeyed the signal of the Lady Mayoress, and retired to the drawing-room—

'With grace,  
Which won who saw, to wish their stay.'

The conversation was, however, in no degree changed in their absence. The Lady Mayoress and her fair friends had taken their share in it with much good sense and delicacy; and their departure, so far from being succeeded by that obstreperous and vulgar merriment, or any thing like that gross profligacy of conversation, which indicates rejoicing at being emancipated from the restraint of female presence, only gave occasion to the Magistrates of Oxford to express their wish, that, in the invitations



to their corporation dinners, arrangements could be made that would include the ladies.

"There can be no question that the influence which well-educated and amiable females have upon society is immense. Among other important effects which it produces, it prevents that conversational mannerism which is otherwise found to characterize the social intercourse of men; and it promotes the observance of those little courtesies, on which so much of the comfort of life unquestionably depends."—pp. 64, 65.

We remember to have seen the last remark of Mr. Dillon very ably supported and illustrated in the singularly edifying Tractate of the Jesuit Theophilus Raynaud, *De sobriâ alterius Sexûs frequentatione per Religiosos viros*.

While the morning of the 26th was yet early, the busy note of preparation announced the approaching departure of the Visitors. The State Barge and Navigation Shallop were already at their moorings.

"In another large boat, half covered with an awning, was his Lordship's Yeoman of the Household, who had charge of the provisions for the Lord Mayor's party; together with the Cook, who was, at the time of embarkation, busily engaged in preparing a fire.

"At a quarter after seven, amidst shouts of reiterated applause from the surrounding multitudes, the City Barge, manned by the city watermen, in scarlet liveries, and all the other boats in attendance on his Lordship, were simultaneously launched on the broad bosom of the princely Thames.

"The immense tide of population which had rolled forth from the city, flowed along with the boats a considerable distance, on both sides of the river; and extreme delight was visible in every countenance. The weather, indeed, was of itself sufficient to give rise to joyous and happy feelings. The rays of a bright sun, streaming through an unclouded sky, poured their enlivening influence all around. It was quite one of those genial mornings, when we seem to draw in delight with the very air we breathe, and to feel happy, we can scarcely tell why."—pp. 70, 71.

At about nine the boats reached Nuneham, but the crew passed it without a glance, being "unitedly engaged in the elegant cabin of the State Barge, in doing honour to the delicacies of the Lord Mayor's breakfast table." As they proceeded, the whole population of the neighbouring villages poured out to greet them, and the Lord Mayor, assisted in his benevolent task by Mr. Alderman Atkins, scattered handfulls of halfpence among the children who thronged the banks. "It was gratifying to see the absence of selfish feeling manifested by some of the elder boys, who, forgetful of themselves, collected for the younger girls;" and this pretty gallantry affords Mr. Dillon another fair opportunity (and in justice to him it must be admitted that he never neglects

them) of moralizing on "smiles," "wine and oil," the "glow of gratitude," and "the fountain of indwelling delight."

Wallingford was the scene of Dinner,—the Bear Inn at Reading that of Supper and Sleep. That of the following Breakfast is not recorded. At *Henley* Mr. Alderman Birch called to the recollection of the party the beautiful lines in which Denham has characterized the Thames at *Cooper's Hill*. The quotation was, perhaps, somewhat premature, and burst from the teeming Alderman many miles before his arrival at the point of seasonable parturition; but Poetry is like bottled beer, and when it once begins to effervesce, it is difficult to hinder it from finding vent at its own pleasure. In the grounds of Cliefden a select party was invited to partake of a rural dinner with the Civic train; and, in order to gratify the intense curiosity of the assembled gazers, the female part was admitted to walk round the tables at which the company was seated. The honest peasantry strained their eyes and pointed their fingers at the Lord Mayor, who was now in his native parish, or near it; and half-suppressed sentences could occasionally be distinguished—"He was born in our village"! Hereon, as might be expected, Mr. Dillon is more than usually pathetic.

By a very natural transition, the learned Chaplain here proceeds to coustrast the character of Augustus with that of George III.; and, while he is so doing, the boats glide on, the clock strikes eleven, and the party falls asleep at Windsor. A visit to the Castle occupied the following morning; and Mr. Dillon has catalogued the Pictures and Apartments with scrupulous fidelity. But we hasten on to the City Stone at Staines, in order to arrive at which the Lord Mayor had travelled to and from Oxford. This venerable monument stands in a meadow at no great distance from the water-side, and bears date A.D. 1285. A procession was marshalled, which walked three times round at a considerable distance; the Sword of State was placed upon it,—the City Banner waved over it,—a Bottle of Wine was broken on it as a libation,—and an Inscription, recording the visit of the Lord Mayor, was ordered to be engraven on its pedestal.

This ceremonial has been illustrated by an Engraving, in which portraits of the principal characters assisting in it are introduced; the Lady Mayoress is smiling and sebaceous,—the Lord Mayor is erect, attentive, and adipose,—and behind him is a figure which, even without the aid of its sacerdotal vestments, we should instantly recognize for the author of this narrative,

"Such gentle touches wanton o'er his face."

With this solemnity ended the interest of the voyage. At

Richmond every one, with a "countenance deeply imbrowned by long exposure to the sun and air," took leave of the Lord Mayor and Lady Mayoress, and returned to his respective home. The Chief Magistrate himself reached his Civic Palace at a few minutes before ten.

Mr. Dillon concludes his Log Book by answering a *cui bono* question. We must give this reply in his own words; at the same time not concealing a shrewd suspicion which we entertain that the devout Chaplain has transplanted it from the peroration of his favourite sermon.

"This little narrative, then, will not have been written entirely in vain, if it shall at all contribute to remind the respected individuals whose names have been mentioned on its pages,—that even if such delightful parties could continue always, and they could dwell together thus harmoniously for the full season of this mortal life; yet that, after a few more years at most, the grave would close its gates between them,—that every page will, ere long, be torn from the volume of every one's life,—and all will have passed away.

"If, however, they shall diligently seek,—and there is but one way,—to be included in the *general assembly and church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven*,—then, though they may chance to pass whole weeks, whole months, and, it may be, whole years, without seeing or knowing any more of each other;—and though death may at last break the bond of their society on earth,—yet, like the waters of that ample stream which has recently borne them so pleasantly along,—separated, for a short time, by the piers of an intervening bridge,—they shall ultimately meet again, in that more perfect state of being, where there shall be neither absence nor interruption; where death is never known, and friends are never parted."—pp. 156, 157.

For ourselves, in conclusion, we cannot but lament that the triple triumphs of Whittington, and the duple dignities of Wood, should have failed to meet with a similar Chronicler. We trust, however, that every future Monarch of Guildhall, whether he proceeds in full Civic pomp to Smithfield, for the proclamation of Bartholomew Fair, or more familiarly visits Greenwich to ingurgitate Whitebait, will intrust the record of those occurrences to the pen of his Chaplain for the time being. So may these great events of his magistracy, which, otherwise, might be fleeting and forgotten, become, as it were, κτήματα ἐς αἰῶν, and be ingrafted on the main stock of ever-during and imperishable History.



ART. XIV.—*A Sermon, preached in the Cathedral Church of Chester, on Sunday, November 5, 1826.* By Edward Copleston, D.D., Dean of Chester, and Provost of Oriel College, Oxford. London, Murray; and Rivingtons. Oxford, Parker. 1826. pp. 36.

THE frequent, and apparently successful, use which is commonly made of the *argumentum ad verecundiam* in the discussion of the Roman Catholic Claims, has often struck us as something surprising. If ever there was a case in which the argument of authority would seem to be decisive against any set of opinions, it is against the opinions of those who advocate the concession of those claims. No one would think of deferring to the prejudices of the clergy in a question of law or physic, or even of mere state policy, as opposed to the concurring sentiments of lawyers and physicians and statesmen; but surely, in a question involving the interests of religion in general, and especially of the Established Church, the opinions of the clergy must be considered, if not of paramount, yet, at least, of the very highest authority.

The Ministers of the Church of England contend that the maintenance of a Protestant Establishment is essential to the existence of true religion in this country; and they further believe, that the admission of Roman Catholics into the legislature would endanger the security of this establishment;—on this point they are unanimous to a degree which is almost without example. This, no doubt, is matter of opinion, but it is a subject on which the clergy are in an especial manner called upon to give their judgment; and backed as that judgment is, in the present instance, by the voice of the immense majority of the people of England, to say that the weight of authority, under such circumstances, is in favour of removing the disabilities which the wisdom of our ancestors found it necessary to impose upon those who belonged to the communion of the Church of Rome, is, we think, a most unaccountable assumption. If the argument were merely as to the effect of such a measure upon the civil liberties of the people, or upon our relations with foreign states, the authority of Burke and Pitt, and Fox and Windham, and of other names which we are disposed to respect, would no doubt possess the greatest weight. But the question is as to the effect of the measure upon the interests of the Established Church and of the Protestant Religion; and here, we presume to say, that we can produce, not one, but a hundred names, any one of which, according to the usual rules by which the value of authority is estimated, will more than counterbalance the weight that can pro-

perly belong to the evidence of mere statesmen, be they ever such able politicians.

The name of Dr. Copleston alone, in such a question, carries with it no light importance; and we congratulate the friends of pure religion upon being able to add his public testimony in support of the same views as have been taken of this much agitated question by almost every distinguished member of the Church. We say nothing of the acknowledged learning of Dr. Copleston, nor of his confessedly superior understanding—cultivated as it has been by meditation, and by an acquaintance both with theology and with philosophy beyond most of his contemporaries. That which gives this sermon its peculiar value, is the well known character of its author, as a person who forms his own opinions upon every subject, and never comes to any important conclusion except when he has himself examined the premises from which it is to be drawn. It is, therefore, with singular pleasure that we introduce to our readers the able and polished production which is prefixed to this article. It was preached in the Cathedral of Chester, on the 5th of November, and has been published at the request of the Bishop and Prebendaries of that Church. The circumstance of its not having been designed for publication would of course be an apology for any defects of a literary kind which it might display; but it stands in need of no such apology; on the contrary, we can sincerely recommend it to our readers almost as a standard tract. There are some remarks which it contains that are, we believe, entirely original; and the whole design of the argument is to exemplify a very important truth, which, if not strictly new, is placed in a new light, and is, moreover, one which it particularly behoves us to remember in the present day, when the religious animosities, that had been laid asleep during the last half century, would appear to be reviving in Europe.

The text is taken from John, xvi. 2. "The time cometh, when whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service." The immediate instruction which Dr. Copleston endeavours to build upon the passage of Scripture in which this text is found, is to point out the tendency which has been displayed in every age of the Christian Church, among those possessed of spiritual authority over mankind, to found upon this authority a claim to temporal dominion. The root of this corruption must be sought in human nature itself; but the argument on which it has always been justified is drawn from the Old Testament. Accordingly this is the first point to which our attention is directed; and the fallacy of the reasoning on which ambitious men have attempted to found a Christian Kingdom upon earth, by pleading the ex-

ample of the Jewish hierarchy, is admirably refuted and explained. The Jewish law was built immediately upon the authority of God, having the maintenance of that authority for its exclusive object. To violate religion therefore, among the Jews, was to transgress against the state; blasphemy, among them, was the same as treason is among us, and, in perfect consistency with the whole spirit of their institutions, was to be punished in the same way. But the abrogation of this union between the secular and the spiritual offices of the state is the very essence of Christianity; and to endeavour to join them together, either in the same persons or under the same sanctions, is to destroy the very foundation on which Christ's Kingdom is built.

“ Yet strongly marked as the contrast thus is between the Jewish and the Christian dispensations, the one being professedly a kingdom of this world, and the other, in the person of its divine Founder, expressly disclaiming all pre-eminence of that kind, it is indeed most remarkable in the history of Christ's Church, how soon corruptions sprang up, which clearly had their origin in the love of temporal greatness, and the desire to substitute a Christian kingdom upon earth corresponding with that Jewish hierarchy whose ordinances had been swallowed up in the Gospel. So powerful is the allurements of earthly splendour and dominion, that the disposition was early manifest to assimilate the Christian worship to the ancient Hebrew ritual. I speak not now of that lingering attachment to their old religion which many of the earliest Jewish converts exhibited, but which wore itself out almost within the age of the apostles. The retrograde tendency to which I refer was not the *remnant* of Judaism, but the gradual growth of a corrupt nature under the specious pretence of a zeal for God's service, and of respect for his laws. Its origin was manifestly independent of all connexion with former habits; for it prevailed most, not in the Eastern provinces, where if such had been its source we should naturally expect to find it, but in the remoter region of the West, where the see of Rome had early acquired an ascendancy, as a pattern and authority in points of practice for other Churches.

“ It is curious to trace the studied imitation in the pomp of their public worship, in the dress of their priests, copied from Aaron's vestments, in the use of oil, and of incense, and of holy water for lustration, in the frivolous distinction of meats and of days, and at length in that grand corruption of doctrine, the parent of a thousand others, that Christ is offered up as a sacrifice by the priest every time his death is commemorated by the solemn participation of bread and wine according to his own institution. Then, too, came the practice of calling the communion table by the name of altar: and there, instead of thankfully remembering the one oblation of himself once made by Christ upon the cross, their priests stood daily offering up their victim, like the priests of the Jewish temple, as an atonement for the sins of the people.

“ Last of all was avowed, with unblushing boldness, the claim of a Christian bishop to the dominion of the earth—a claim advanced in the



name of Him, and as the servant of Him, who declared that his kingdom was not of this world. Upon this claim naturally followed all the ordinary expedients which earthly governments employ to compel obedience, and to punish rebellion. The purity of the faith was to be maintained by terror, by torture, by sanguinary executions; and men were taught to put their fellow-creatures to death as an act well-pleasing to God, and even beneficial to the unhappy sufferer himself."—pp. 10-13.

Dr. Copleston then proceeds to remark, how inveterately this disposition, above referred to, is rooted in mankind; instancing examples of it in the Protestant as well as in the Papal Church; and drawing from such examples matter of well-grounded caution, especially to those who are placed in the situation of Ministers of the Gospel. The passage in which this salutary precaution is expressed, is conveyed in language which could not be misunderstood in any times except the present; in order to prevent any mistake, however, as to his true meaning, as if he thought that in this respect all religions were alike, he quickly subjoins a remark pointing out a fundamental distinction between the Church of Rome, and those who have separated from her.

"Let me not however be misunderstood. If it be a legitimate object, as I certainly hold it to be, of civil government, to maintain and establish the purest form of Christianity, it must in candour be allowed to the bishops and pastors of that Church to feel a livelier interest and a prompter zeal in its defence than can be expected from the generality of its lay members. By their education moreover they are frequently enabled to understand more correctly, and to explain more clearly to others, the grounds and the utility of a religious establishment, than thousands of their fellow-subjects among whom they live. If therefore, upon the prospect of danger, they appear foremost in giving the alarm, if in case of observing a culpable indifference to such things, they endeavour to conquer the apathy, to awaken the attention, to enlighten the mind, or to direct the judgment of their neighbours, they cannot with reason be said to exceed their province, or to abuse their sacred office. But the truth unquestionably is, that in this country the public mind is too apt to be violently excited upon such questions; and the duty of a minister of religion much more frequently consists in softening prejudices and animosities, and in allaying the heat of party feeling, than in stimulating the minds of men to an active and eager interest in them.

"In reminding you however of the share which even Protestant Churches have had in the guilt of persecution, it is necessary to point out a material distinction between our case and that of the Church of Rome. The duty or the right of persecution we no longer assert. It never did form a part of our public professions. And now that our eyes are opened and our minds better informed, we not only disclaim it, but condemn it. We lament the errors of our forefathers, and we teach our children to avoid the same mistaken course, as being offensive to God, and in direct disobedience to the commands of our Saviour.

"In behalf of the Church of Rome the same thing cannot be said : nor indeed with the pretensions of that Church to infallibility is the plea possible. Individuals we know there are among them, composing perhaps the great majority of that communion, who lament, and reprobate, and abhor persecutions : but it is not with individuals that we are concerned : it is with the Church of Rome itself ; and that Church neither has abandoned the claim, nor, however it may have disapproved the exercise of it in any particular case, has it ever condemned—it never *can* condemn the principle—for by so doing it would condemn the very principle upon which its own arrogant pretensions to preeminence and universal rule are founded."—pp. 16—18.

What defensive measures may be required, in any Protestant state, to guard against the evils that may arise from the toleration of a religion such as that of Rome, Dr. Copleston omits to consider, as not forming a proper subject of consideration from the pulpit. But he concludes with a recommendation of some serious advice to all who interest themselves in the discussion of the question in the present day ; and which, for the wisdom it contains, as well as for the earnest eloquence with which it is expressed, deserves to be imprinted upon the hearts and understandings of all who possess any influence either in church or state, in parliament or in the country.

"But if such be the caution requisite for those who think some restraints upon our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects essential to our own security, still graver is the duty of those who seek to remove them altogether, and still more solemn should be the warning addressed to *them*, not to bend religion to their political views ; not to represent the difference as slight or unimportant between the pure doctrines of our Church and that spurious mixture of fraud, of fable, of priestcraft and superstition, with which the Church of Rome has corrupted and overlaid the Gospel. To know what the doctrines of that Church really are, we must seek them in countries where her sway is undisputed, and her spiritual darkness not illumined by any friendly ray issuing from the brighter bodies that surround it. It is in this way we reason upon all other subjects. If for instance we are desirous of learning the genuine properties of any material substance, which is commonly found in contact or in combination with others, we carefully separate, as far as we can, the foreign ingredients, and think we ascertain the true character of the body we are considering, in proportion as we examine it in its insulated and independent state. Let the same test be applied to the Romish Church ; and we shall find that precisely as its characteristic tenets have prevailed, the spirit of real Christianity has declined. Her policy has ever been to keep the people in blind subjection to the priesthood : and as ignorance and superstition and imposing ceremonies have always been the readiest means of accomplishing this purpose, so has that Church not scrupled to employ them, according to the power she possessed, till at length the religion of Christ has been made to resemble a political machine, or a

heathen pageant, instead of being the guide of men's lives, and the source of hope and holy comfort to their souls, through faith in the merits of their Redeemer.

"If the false estimate I allude to of the difference between the Protestant and the Romish faith arise from inattention or from ignorance, we must pity either the want of information, in matters concerning which it is so easily to be obtained, or the want of power to discriminate between things really so different in their own nature. But if from any selfish or any worldly motive this representation is ever made, if party spirit, or a love of popularity, or a foolish desire of being thought liberal, or a dread of popish vengeance, or a mean subserviency to the political views of others—if these or any one of these motives possess the heart, and incline it to prevaricate in so sacred a cause, deep indeed is the guilt of that man, and flagrant the insult offered to the Majesty of Heaven. But let not any one, as he values the honour of God and the peace and salvation of his own soul, let him not burden his conscience with a sin so grievous. Let him not thus provoke the righteous judgment of God. It is a wilful sacrifice of divine truth to worldly feelings and worldly interests. And as the Almighty rejected Saul from being king over Israel, when he presumed to make religion subordinate to his schemes of policy, so will Christ reject those from a share in his kingdom, who are ashamed or afraid under any circumstances to confess him before men, or who think that any object upon earth can be so important as to justify a compromise of the pure word of God in order to obtain it."—pp. 22—25.

We make no apology to our readers for the length of these extracts. The name and reputation and rank of Dr. Copleston in the Church will give them an interest with our readers. But the passages which we have selected require no extrinsic recommendation of this sort. Independently of their beauty as specimens of composition, the force of reasoning they display, and the importance of the subject to which they relate, will ensure them the attention they deserve. We cannot, however, close our remarks without extracting one passage more, which is to be found in the notes appended to the Sermon. Dr. Copleston is speaking of the undue authority attached by some persons to the declarations of individuals among the Roman Catholics disavowing the opinions with which they are charged as a body; and the contempt with which their opponents are treated, when they produce the evidence of history, in every age of the Romish church, from the tenth century to the present, as a justification of the scepticism with which such declarations of individuals ought to be received. The remark of Dr. Copleston on this subject is admirable.

"And here I cannot but admire the course of reasoning which many of the advocates of the Roman Catholics have pursued, even when arguing in their capacity as statesmen a point of practical policy. With such men, one would think, the evidence of history and the testimony



of facts would carry more weight than the most explicit declarations upon paper of the present and still more of a remote age. But when the language of disavowal comes not from the fountain head, when it is merely the fine-spun distinction of some theologian or casuist, commenting upon the disputed text in which the real authority lies; when this subtle interpretation, be it sound or be it not, yet is produced as an acute solution of a difficulty felt by Romanists themselves, and is recommended as useful to the study of their own divines; when, I say, this single argument is placed in one scale against the overpowering weight of historical evidence joined to the avowed doctrine of their most approved expositors, Bossuet and Bellarmine, on the other, I am at a loss to conceive how such men can have yielded up their judgment to such a process of reasoning.

"Let us for a moment suppose the case to have been inverted—that the evidence of facts was on the side of the Roman Catholics, and that their adversaries produced not so much as an antiquated dogma of confessed authority, but the *interpretation* only of such a dogma by some learned casuist—and that this interpretation gave to it a force contradictory to the whole series of facts which could be alleged on the other side. Would not the able and eloquent advocates of their cause have scouted such an appeal to antiquity and scholastic lore, in opposition to the substantial evidence afforded by experience? Would they not have covered the author of such an argument with contempt and derision, and driven him by the powers of their eloquence from the deliberations of a senate to the dust and cobwebs of his forgotten volumes?"—pp. 32, 33.

We regret that our limits do not permit us to present our readers with the continuation of the note, in which Dr. Copleston points out the strong presumption which exists against the credit of all such disavowals on the part of irresponsible individuals, arising from the silence of those authorities whose denial would be conclusive. But we must not trespass any farther upon our limits. Our object in the passages which we have extracted has been rather to excite than to satisfy the desire of our readers, to procure this admirable sermon; and having effected this, as we hope, by the specimens we have selected, it only remains for us to thank Dr. Copleston, as well for the pleasure he has afforded us, as for the service which he has rendered the Church, by his seasonable and able publication.

---

ART. XV.—1. *Two Letters to the Right Rev. J. Milner, D.D. Bishop of Castabala, Vic. Ap. &c. Occasioned by certain Passages in his "End of Religious Controversy."* By the Rev. T. H. Lowe, M.A. Vicar of Grimley, in the County of Worcester, and Chaplain to the Right Hon. Viscount Gage. London: Rivingtons. 1826.

2. *A Letter to the Right Rev. John Milner, D.D. upon certain erroneous Statements, and incorrect Quotations affecting the Character of Eminent Divines of the Church of England, in a Book entitled "The End of Religious Controversy."* By the Rev. John Garbett, M.A. Minister of St. George's, Birmingham. London: Rivingtons, Hatchards. 1826.

THE death of Bishop Milner, which happened shortly after the appearance of these pamphlets, has disappointed the expectations of a personal reply, which were fully entertained by their authors. But it is still to be hoped that the Roman Catholic Church will furnish us with a defence of her deceased champion. During many a year he was the most learned, the most acute, and, as he himself assured us, the most successful of her polemics. His attempts to explain away her obnoxious tenets have been imitated by Mr. Butler, and outdone by Dr. Doyle. But in the more important task of *terminating* a dispute which has lasted for three hundred years, Bishop Milner stands alone; and his "*End of Controversy*" ought to be protected against the charges with which it was assailed. Unless this is done, Protestants will be justified in saying that it cannot be done; and this popular apology for the tenets of the Church of Rome will rank among the books which that Church disowns.

Whether such repudiation ought, or ought not, to take place, it is for the Romanists, not for us, to determine. But we are disposed to think that the argumentative portion of the "*End of Controversy*" calls for a more succinct answer than it has hitherto received. Substantial answers are already on record. Indeed it would be no difficult task to refute the "*End of Controversy*," upon all its leading points, without introducing a single sentence that has not been in print for a century and a half. The great Protestant writers have answered Bishop Milner again and again; and, at times, we have felt strongly tempted to make a cento from their masterly works, in which the modern Coryphæus of Rome should be put to silence, not by the pigmy efforts of his contemporaries, but by the exact argumentation of Chillingworth and the copious learning of Barrow. This however might be deemed a fantastic operation; and it would, perhaps, be more expedient to

adapt the suitable parts of their immortal works to the new position in which Bishop Milner has arrayed the discomfited arguments of Bellarmine.

But even this cannot be attempted at present. To follow the learned writer through all his turnings and windings, to point out his unauthorised and vague assumptions, his equivocal expressions, his artful substitutions of one term for another, and his illogical inferences and conclusions, would take up more space than we can spare for this article. The master sophism which pervades his volume is a studied confusion between the Rule of Faith and the proper Method of interpreting that rule. These are essentially distinct, and truth can never be discovered by confounding them. Yet the very basis of Bishop Milner's argument takes it for granted, that in the case of Protestants the Rule and the Interpretation of it are one and the same thing, and that in the case of the Roman Catholics, the Rule is both rule and interpretation and the Interpretation both interpretation and rule. (Compare "End of Controversy," p. 42, with "Vindication of the End of Controversy," p. 21 and p. 352.) The object of this sophism is to avoid the awkwardness incidental to the Roman Catholic practice of proving the authority of the Church from the Scriptures, and the authority of the Scriptures from the Church. How completely the manœuvre fails, we need not now observe. The works before us call our attention rather to the controversial honesty than to the skill or success of Dr. Milner; and we extract a few passages from each, which may serve to place the former in a clear light.

Mr. Lowe, in his learned and able pamphlet, points out the following, among many other instances, of Bishop Milner's fair dealing :

"Your proofs, however, from the Fathers, that it [tradition] is even equal to Scripture, miserably fail you. I cannot think it necessary to examine at length your arguments and authorities in defence of this position, for the very first passage you have alleged in its support is so garbled and perverted, that it must utterly ruin your credit with every honest mind. *Tam apertè fumos venditanti etiam jurato non crediderim.* The passage to which I allude occurs in your Tenth Letter, p. 83 : and is as follows : 'I begin with the disciple of the Apostles, St. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch. It is recorded of him that, in his passage to Rome, where he was sentenced to be devoured by wild beasts, he exhorted the Christians, who got access to him, "to guard themselves against the rising heresies, and to adhere with the utmost firmness to the *tradition of the Apostles* :"' WHICH, FOR THE SAKE OF SECURITY, HE THOUGHT IT NECESSARY THEY SHOULD HAVE DRAWN UP IN WRITING.' These last words you wholly omit, and produce the first part of the sentence to prove, that, in the apostolic age, the unwritten word, or tradition, was



held in equal estimation with the Scripture itself. What must we think of a cause that can only be supported by such contemptible artifices?"—pp. 30, 31.

"Whatever arguments may be urged against the worship of the glorified saints and angels, apply, with equal force, to the adoration of their images and relics. I have shown, from the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna, that, in the time of St. Polycarp, the adoration of relics was not practised among Christians. But with respect to the worship of angels and saints, you have alleged a passage from St. Justin Martyr, in which, you say, it is expressly maintained: 'We venerate and worship the angelic host, and the spirits of the prophets, teaching others as we ourselves have been taught.' Such is your translation of St. Justin; and such a specimen of shameless fraud, or incredible ignorance, (you may take your choice,) I firmly believe cannot be paralleled in the whole history of controversy. 'We confess,' says St. Justin, who is defending the Christians from the imputation of Atheism, 'that with respect to such reputed gods we are atheists; but not with respect to the most true God, the Father of righteousness and prudence, and all other virtues; in whom is no admixture of evil. But Him, and his Son, who came from Him, and taught us these things, and the Prophetic Spirit, we worship and adore, in reason and in truth; honouring likewise the host of the other good angels, who minister to Him, and resemble Him.\* I give the passage below, as it stands in the common editions; in the translation, I have not hesitated to adopt the emendation of Dr. Ashton, which is amply justified by the parallel passage, chap. xvi., and is absolutely necessary, unless we would make St. Justin affirm, that the angels, &c. are to be worshipped in the very same manner and degree as the blessed Trinity:—an impiety which, I am sure, Sir, you would not impute to him. Besides, in the language of St. Justin, the words *σεβέσθαι* and *προσκυνεῖν*, always imply that worship which is due to God only. For example; he tells the emperor, that though the Christians thought it unlawful to adore him, they considered it a primary part of their duty to pay all taxes and tribute; for that Christ himself had commanded them, to 'render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's.'† In obedience to which precept, he says, 'We worship God only; but render you a cheerful obedience in all other things.'‡ A passage, by the way, which cuts up your groundless distinction of *Latria*, as the only kind of worship peculiar to God. But to what purpose do I address myself, on such subjects, to a man who translates *Πνεῦμα τὸ προφητικόν*, THE SPIRITS OF THE PROPHETS!"—pp. 45—47.

While Mr. Lowe has thus followed Bishop Milner through his references to the Fathers, and pointed out his very peculiar style

\* Justin. Apol. c. vi. καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν τῶν τοιούτων νομιζομένων θεῶν ἄθεοι εἶναι, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τοῦ ἀληθεστάτου, καὶ πατρὸς δικαιοσύνης καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν, ἀνεπιμικτοῦ τε κακίας θεοῦ ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνον τε, καὶ τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ υἱὸν ἐλθόντα, καὶ διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα, καὶ τὸν τῶν ἄλλων ἐπομένων καὶ ἐξομοιουμένων ἀγαθῶν ἀγγέλων στρατὸν, πνεῦμά τε τὸ προφητικὸν σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνούμεν, λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τιμῶντες.

† Justin. Apol. c. 23. "Ὅθεν θεὸν μὲν μόνον προσκυνούμεν ἡμῖν δὲ πρὸς τὰ ἄλλα χαίροντες ὑπερητούμεν.

of quotation, Mr. Garbett examines the accusations which have been brought against the Bishops of the Church of England, and vindicates them against the charges of hypocrisy which were urged with so little reserve by Dr. Milner, and, in some instances, repeated by Mr. Charles Butler. We cannot follow the author through his detailed and useful inquiries on this subject, but confidently recommend such persons as entertain any doubts respecting the character of Bishop Milner to peruse the whole of these two pamphlets.\* The following passages will probably prove more interesting to our readers than such as refer to the conduct of individuals, against whom much has been said, but nothing proved or believed.

“ I proceed next to vindicate a very learned and acute defender of Christianity from the charge of falsely translating one of his authorities.

“ In the ‘ Criterion ’ of Bishop Douglas, a negative argument is drawn against the genuineness of the miracles imputed by your Church to Francis Xavier, from the silence of the Jesuit Missionary, Acosta ; in whose book, says his Lordship, ‘ we find an express acknowledgment, that no miracles had ever been performed by Missionaries amongst the Indians.’ Thus far you quote the Bishop ; but the pith of his argument consists in the words immediately following. ‘ For,’ he adds, ‘ Acosta assigns it as one reason why the Gospel was not propagated by them with the same success as it was by the Apostles, that the power of working miracles did not subsist among the Missionaries ; who not being able to excite the admiration or the fear of the barbarians, by the majesty of any such works, were, consequently, despised by reason of their mean appearance.’ This is the passage, upon quoting the former part of which, you exclaim—‘ What will the admirers of this Detector say, if it should appear that Acosta barely says, “ that there was not the same *faculty* or *facility* of working miracles among the Missionaries, which there was among the Apostles ? ” (p. 187.) The best reply to this demand will be to produce the words of Acosta, as I find them in the ‘ Criterion,’ not having the book itself at hand to consult. You give us only the first part of the passage, omitting that which would clear away all ambiguity, if any such there were, in your extract, ‘ *Altera causa in nobis est, cur apostolica prædicatio institui omnino non possit apostolice, quod miraculorum nulla facultas sit ;—nostri nunc temporis cum talium operum majestate sese barbaris admirandos et timendos non præbeant, nihil restat nisi ut reliqua vitæ inopia et impotentia penitus contemnatur.*’ No

\* The absurd accusation against the late Bishop Halifax, which originated with Bishop Milner, has been revived, we observe, in a provincial newspaper by a Clergyman of the Church of Rome ; and coupled with a similar charge against the late Sir John Cox Hoppesley. The latter accusation is as contemptible as the former. If a shadow of doubt exist in the mind of any individual respecting the truth of the charges against Bishop Halifax, let him consult a pamphlet written by the Bishop, within a few weeks of his death, entitled, *An Apology for the Liturgy and Clergy of the Church of England*, by a *Clergyman*. Rivingtons. 1790. In this pamphlet Bishop Halifax speaks of *Papery* in language which cannot be mistaken.

one can, for an instant, doubt of the strict accuracy of the Bishop's version. Acosta most explicitly declares, first, that the preaching of the gospel could not be carried on by them with the success of the Apostles, because they had 'not any power of doing miracles, *miraculorum nulla facultas.*' Secondly, that they could not render themselves objects of terror or admiration to the barbarians, by the 'majesty of such works,' and were therefore utterly despised; which he could scarcely have said, if they had any miraculous powers: much less, if he believed, as you tell us, that Xavier himself performed miracles 'too numerous to be related.'—pp. 51—53.

"In p. 129, you tell the world, to gratify, I presume, the popular love of novelty, that the omission of this Creed, 'so often took place in public Service, that an Act of Parliament has just been passed to enforce the repetition of it.' Upon this extraordinary statement, I would only observe, that if you really are aware of the existence of such an Act—of which no one in the kingdom, except yourself, has ever heard,—you might possibly render a kindness to some persons who may unwarily transgress any of its enactments, by informing them where this secret piece of legislation is to be found."—p. 54.

The last piece of intelligence may perhaps claim to be excused as a blunder. Had Dr. Milner been a person of less pretension to accuracy, such an excuse might be admitted. As it is, we can only explain the absurdity of advancing such a ridiculous charge by comparing it with another passage in the same volume, (End of Controversy, p. 57,) in which the Doctor, undertaking to prove that the Scriptures were not designed for a Rule of Faith, declares that "St. Luke addressed his Gospel to an individual, Theophilus, having *written it*, says the holy Evangelist, because it seemed good to him so to do." Is this to be denominated carelessness, or fatuity, or fraud? We leave it to the surviving friends of Bishop Milner to answer the question.

ART. XVI.—*A Sermon preached before the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts; at their Anniversary Meeting in the Parish Church of St. Mary-le-Bow, on Friday, February 15, 1827.* By the Right Reverend Charles James, Lord Bishop of Chester. London. Rivingtons. 1827. 8vo. 1s. 6d. pp. 24.

THE Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts very judiciously requested the Bishop of Chester "to permit the immediate publication of this Sermon, as containing observations which have a direct reference to the state of the Church of India, during the vacancy of the See of Calcutta." And to these observations, consequently, must our chief attention be directed. But it would be unjust to the preacher, as well as the Society whose



cause he advocates, to omit all notice of that portion of his Lordship's discourse which refers to the general diffusion of Christianity, and to the past and present prospects of the Church in North America.

Having contrasted the rapid propagation of the Gospel during the first age of the Church, with the tardy advances which have been since made, the Bishop adverts to the unhappy success of those enemies of the Church who have wrested from it no inconsiderable part of its territories, and adds an impressive warning, together with an able vindication of the ancient proceedings of the Society.

His Lordship than remarks, that the duty incumbent upon a Christian government of providing for the religious instruction of its subjects cannot be denied, however the acknowledgment of it may be evaded, and trusting that this will be remembered by the promoters of emigration, he proceeds to the second great division of the discourse, and shows that the conversion of unbelievers, a work from which the state may *possibly* claim an exemption, is the legitimate object of a voluntary association.

This is a just and important distinction. The neglect with which Christianity has been treated in our North American colonies, is utterly indefensible. As such it is now regarded by the country, and we trust by his majesty's ministers also. When any fresh instance of its existence comes under notice, we are not called upon to prove that it ought to cease, but it suffices to point out the nuisance, and require that it be abated without delay; the scandal is gross and offensive, and no apology short of its removal can be accepted. But men are not yet agreed in opinion, how far the ruling powers are bound to promote the evangelization of the heathen, within the limits of their territory; and the manly and Christian arguments by which the Bishop of Chester contends that no government can be exonerated from such a duty, are destined, we trust, to turn the scale which has hung long in doubt. The passages in which his Lordship applies his general reasoning to the present state of the Church in India, will make our readers acquainted with the outline of his argument.

“ I would direct this inquiry, with peculiar earnestness of application, to our relations with that vast empire which has sprung up in the East, like the seed which is cast into the ground, and springeth and groweth up, men know not how. Has either part of the obligation, incumbent on a Christian country, been adequately fulfilled; the providing for the spiritual nurture and steadfastness of those who are already believers, or the bringing of the heathen into the fold of Christ ?

“ It is only of late that the rulers of that prodigious empire have opened their eyes to the necessity of planting in those regions, where

Christianity can afford to dispense with none of her means or aids, a religious establishment, formed after that model, which the apostles themselves stationed in the midst of an unbelieving world. From that moment it may be said of our Indian possessions, that the Lord hath *planted a vineyard there, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and at the season He will send his servants to receive the fruit; and we are persuaded, not in vain.*"—p. 16.

"It was the peculiar felicity of that Church, rather, I should say, it was of God's providential appointment, that its first rulers and nursing fathers were two men, singularly gifted and qualified for the work which it fell to their lot to perform. To the enlarged wisdom, the sagacious discernment, the sound discretion, the steady perseverance *through evil report and good report*, the uncompromising firmness, the calm and steady piety of him, who laid its foundations, and planned its outworks, and delineated, with the eye and the hand of a master, the provinces of its officers, a just and well remembered tribute has been rendered from this place. How little did we think, while listening with mournful interest to that eloquent expression of deep regret and cheering anticipation, that within four short years the melancholy theme was to be resumed, and the second Indian bishop spoken of, as one called to his account. Yet it is doubtless within the recollection of some who now hear me, that when that lamented servant of God addressed his parting words of promise and encouragement to the venerable Society, which had long watched over and fostered the Protestant Missions in India, a sentiment of foreboding mingled itself in the minds of many with that of rejoicing and hope, *lest they should see his face no more.*

"They beheld in him an ardent zeal for God's glory and the salvation of men; a spirit of unqualified self-devotion; an unreserved dedication of himself to the holy cause which he had taken in hand; a willing and deliberate sacrifice of personal ease and comfort, both in possession and in prospect; a singleness and fixedness of determination to *spend and be spent* for the gospel; the concentration, upon that single object, of all the powers and resources of a mind unusually gifted by nature, and perfected by education; an apostolical simplicity of heart and manner, and an almost apostolical eloquence: all this they saw, and rejoiced in the abundance of those graces, which bespoke *the man of God thoroughly furnished unto all good works.*

"But when they considered that *this treasure was in earthen vessels*, and that the full and satisfactory discharge of the duties which he had undertaken, was beyond and above the scope of individual strength and opportunity, yet not above the enterprise of a spirit like his; and when they remembered how fatal a proof had just been given of the utter disproportion between the labours of the Indian episcopate and the provision made for their discharge,—they felt an irresistible presage of evil. And how have both their hopes and their apprehensions been realized!

"How has the Christian Church in India rejoiced, and put forth its infant strength under his fostering care! How have the great designs of its founder been developed and executed, as far as time and means permitted, by his successor! How were the beauty and simplicity of the Gospel enforced by his eloquence, and exemplified in his life! How

have the sanctity and the usefulness of his sacred office been demonstrated by many proofs and marks of an apostolical ministry; *in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities—in labours, in watchings, in fastings—by pureness, by knowledge, by long-suffering—by love unfeigned; by the word of truth—by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left!*

“How lively an interest did he excite, amongst those who were before indifferent, in the success of that great object which was his own *heart's desire*, the conversion of the heathen! How did he bend the eyes and hearts of men towards himself as the Chief Missionary of the East; a high and venerable designation, which he deserved, and in which he delighted!

“But as he *counted not his life dear unto himself, so that he might finish his course with joy, and the ministry which he had received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the Grace of God*; so under the labours of that ministry did he sink, and in the discharge of its most solemn and affecting duties was suddenly called to his Lord. *Blessed is that servant, whom his Lord when he cometh shall find so doing.*

“And others, no doubt, may be found, to run the same career of usefulness and hazard. But is it not the duty of those in whose hands Providence has placed the means, at once to increase the usefulness and to diminish the hazard of the episcopal office in India, by sending forth more labourers into a harvest, the gathering in of which exhausted the vital energies of a Middleton and a Heber? Shall the advocate of Christian missions suffer this opportunity to pass, without expressing an earnest hope that the spiritual claims of millions of benighted subjects, the sacred interests of the Gospel cause, the loud and deep expression of opinion from a Christian people, may at length and for ever preponderate against the sordid calculations of a secular policy, and the deadening influence of that worldly wisdom which *careth for none of these things*, but regards all modes of religion with equal indifference; and that, as far as human means can be effectual, *the word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified* in that country to which so vast a debt is due?”—pp. 18—21.

When we read this eloquent and affecting passage, and remember the character of the prelate by whom it was spoken, we cannot bring ourselves to believe that it has been spoken in vain. In the temperate and religious advice, in the simple energetic language of the Bishop of Chester, we recognize the voice of the Church of England, speaking in the person of one of her most respected sons,—and we are confident she will be listened to with respect. It is understood that the East India Company are willing to comply with the reasonable request of the Church: it is impossible to believe that his Majesty's Government are unwilling. They acknowledge that a division of the Diocese of Calcutta is desirable; and they have furnished the strongest argument for it themselves—MINISTERS HAVE BEEN ACQUAINTED WITH BISHOP HEBER'S DECEASE FOR MORE THAN HALF A YEAR, AND ARE NOT PREPARED TO SUPPLY HIS PLACE.



# LAW PROCEEDINGS

## RELATIVE TO THE CHURCH.

---

### LORD SONDES v. FLETCHER.

A QUESTION of the highest importance, as it regards the government of the church on the one hand, and the rights of patrons on the other, has lately occupied the attention of the House of Lords, upon an appeal from a judgment of the Court of King's Bench, affirmed by the Court of Exchequer Chamber. The action was brought upon a bond, with a penalty of £12,000, which was given by Mr. *Fletcher*, who had been presented to the Living of Kettering, in Northamptonshire, by Lord *Sondes*. The condition of the bond was to vacate the living, upon the request of the patron, as soon as one of the brothers of Lord *Sondes* should be qualified to be presented as rector. Among other things, the condition recited that the living had become vacant, and that Lord *Sondes* had presented it to Mr. *Fletcher* by an instrument bearing the same date as the bond. The breach assigned of the condition was, that Mr. *Fletcher*, upon a request to resign (one of the younger brothers of Lord *Sondes* being capable of holding) had refused to vacate the living. The defendant having suffered judgment by default, a writ of inquiry was executed, and the damages assessed at £12,000, the amount of the penalty; upon which the judgment was entered. Upon the appeal to the House of Lords, after the case had been elaborately argued by counsel, the question was put to the judges,—“whether sufficient matter appears upon the record to show that, either by the statute or the common law, the bond upon which the action was brought and stated to bear equal date with the presentation, is void or illegal?” Upon this question the judges, not being agreed, gave their opinions seriatim.

Mr. *Justice Gaselee* (after stating the facts) proceeded as follows: The ground of objection which has been taken to this bond is that it is simoniacal, and not only contrary to the statute of 31 *Eliz.* c. 6., but, also, to the common law and public policy. But another question has been raised at the bar,—whether, admitting this objection to be good, it can be taken advantage of in the present state of the record, or whether there should not have been a plea averring that the bond was given in consideration of the presentation? It will not be necessary to consume much time in the consideration of this question, because it appears to me to be impossible to read the condition of the bond without coming to the conclusion, that the bond was given in consideration of the presentation, and if so, it is unnecessary to introduce any specific averment of that fact.

I shall therefore confine my observations to the principal question, whether special resignation bonds, for the purpose of presenting particular persons when capable of taking the benefice, are legal, and whether the persons mentioned in this condition are such in whose behalf such a stipulation may be made? Of course I confine myself to special resignation bonds, because, since the case of *Ffytche* and the Bishop of *London*, which was decided in this House in the year 1783, I am precluded from contending that a general resignation bond can, under any circumstances, be supported. Before the determination of that case by this House, there had been many cases in which it had been decided by the courts below that general resignation bonds were upon the face of them good, and were not to be avoided except by plea showing them to have been originally made upon some corrupt contract not appearing upon the bond itself, or that an ill use was endeavoured to be made of them, by attempting to put them in force for improper purposes; in which latter case the remedy was an application to a court of equity for an injunction to restrain their being put in suit. It is true that in some of the cases before *Ffytche* and the Bishop of *London*, doubts had been thrown out as to the validity of general bonds of resignation, but in most, if not all the cases, special bonds for legitimate purposes, among which the presenting the patron himself, his son, or, (as one of the cases has it,) his friend, were held to be good. And it is surely quite evident that there is a manifest distinction between general and special bonds of resignation, in as much as, if the patron wishes to sell the advowson, it is much more valuable by means of a general bond of resignation, the purchaser can at any time compel a vacancy. This cannot be in the case of a special bond like the present, but on the contrary, as in general the party intended to be presented is under age when the bond is given, the consequence of his being presented would be the putting in a younger life, which would generally render the advowson less valuable as an object of sale.

The first case with which I shall trouble your lordships is *Johnes v. Lawrence*,\* which is thus reported by Croke, J. twenty-one years only after passing the 31st of Elizabeth:—"Debt upon an obligation of 1000 marks conditioned: whereas the obligee had procured from Queen Elizabeth letters of presentation to the church of Stretham, and was to present *Lawrence*, intending when his son *John* should be capable to procure another presentation of him to the said church, if the said obligor, within three months after his request, upon his presentation, admission, institution, and induction to the said church, should resign his benefice absolutely; that then the obligation shall be void. The defendant pleads that he was not requested; and issue joined thereupon and found for the plaintiff, and moved in arrest of judgment: First, that it appears by the condition of the bond to be a simoniacal contract, and against law, and therefore the obligation void, *sed non allocatur*, for there doth not any simony appear upon the condition. And such a condition is good enough, and lawful, wherefore it was adjudged for the plaintiff. Afterwards a writ of error was brought upon this judgment in the Exchequer Chamber, and the principal error insisted upon was, that this condition is against law, for it appears upon the condition entered, that it was for simony, which makes the obligation void; but all the judges of the Com-

\* Cro. Jac. 248. See also p. 274.

mon Bench and Barons of the Exchequer held, that the obligation and condition are good enough; for a man may bind himself to resign, and it is not unlawful, but may be upon good and valuable reasons, without any colour of simony: As to be obliged to resign if he take another benefice, or if he be non-resident for the space of so many months, or, as this case is, to resign upon request, if the patron will present his son thereto when he should be of age capable to take it. But if it had been averred that it was per colorem simonii; viz.—If he did not suffer the patron to enjoy a lease of the glebe or tithes, or if he did not pay such a sum of money, that had been simony, and it is possible might have made the obligation void. But as this case is, there doth not appear any cause to adjudge it to be void for simony; wherefore the judgment was affirmed.”

The doctrine in the case of *Johnes v. Lawrence*, was adopted and acted upon in the subsequent case of *Babington v. Wood*:\* “Debt upon an obligation conditioned: whereas the plaintiff intended to present the defendant to such a benefice, that if the defendant, at any time after his admission, institution and induction, at the plaintiff’s request, resigned the said benefice into the hands of the Bishop of London, that then, &c. The defendant, upon oyer of the condition, demurred generally. And this was argued by *Grinston* for the plaintiff, and by *Calthrop* for the defendant, who showed that the cause of demurre was, for that the condition of the bond being to resign upon request of the patron, it is simony and against law; so the bond void. But all the Court conceived that if the defendant had averred, that the obligation was made to bind him to pay such a sum, or to make a lease or other act which appears in itself to be simony, then upon such a plea, peradventure it might have appeared to the Court to be simony, and might have been a question whether such a bond for simony should be void: but as it is pleaded by way of demurrer upon the oyer of the condition, it doth not appear that there is any simony; for such a bond to cause him to resign may be good, and upon good reason and discretion required by the patron, viz.—If he be non-resident, or takes a second benefice by a qualification, or the like; and a precedent was shown in octavo Jacobi, betwixt *Johnes* and *Lawrence*, where such a bond was made to resign a benefice upon request, when the son of *Johnes* came to be twenty-four years of age, to the intent that he might be presented unto it: and it was adjudged good in the King’s Bench, and affirmed on a writ of error in the Exchequer Chamber, and of this opinion was all the Court; whereupon judgment was given for the plaintiff. *Hatton*, who reports the same case, says, that upon error brought in the Exchequer Chamber the judgment was affirmed, (Jones, 220. S. C.) accordingly, and that it was affirmed in error upon viewing the precedent of *Johnes v. Lawrence*.”

In that case it does not appear that the condition of the bond was to resign in favour of any particular person, but generally; but it is obvious that the case turns mainly upon *Johnes v. Lawrence*, which it treats therefore as an express authority.

In an anonymous case, reported in 3 Modern, 54, in which a general bond of resignation was held good, although Mr. Justice *Powel* states his opinion, “that when first the judges held these bonds good, if they had

\* Cro. Car. 180. Hatt. 220. S. C.



foreseen the mischief of them, they would have been of another opinion." Yet he considers that the patron having a son of his own, who may be capable of a benefice, it is an honest intent : and Justice *Blinckow* says, " Here is a particular circumstance why it should not be thought simony ; because it is a sum much above the value of the benefice : if indeed it had been for a sum of less value, it might be intended perhaps that the parson would rather pay it than resign : " and be it remembered, Justice *Twisden* said, " he had known such a bond held good twelve times ; so it would be hard to oppose it now, there appearing no simony in the condition, and the defendant not averring any."

What proportion the penalty in this bond of £12,000 bears to the value of the living does not appear ; but it must be taken for granted the bond was bona fide given for the purpose mentioned in the condition. If it were really colorable, and the real intention was that there should be no resignation, but that the patron should receive the penalty, it should have been pleaded, and that might have altered the case.

The case of *Hilliard v. Stapylton*\* is thus reported : " The guardian of an infant presented to a living, and took a bond from the incumbent to resign within two months after request of the patron or his heirs, it being designed that he should have the living himself when capable. The patron afterwards died an infant at the University, leaving two sisters his heirs, who pressed the incumbent to resign, and for not doing it, put the bond in suit, and recovered judgment ; and this bill was brought to be relieved against the bond and judgment. And it was proved in the cause that they had treated with the incumbent to sell him the perpetual advowson, and had said that if he would not give £700 for it, they would make him resign. The Lord *Keeper* said, the proof in this case lies on the defendants' part, and unless they make out some good reason for removing him, he should certainly decree against the bond. Bonds for resignation have been held good in law. The statute of 31 *Eliz.* against simony, made the penalty upon the lay patron ; and he did not remember any case of resignation bonds before that statute, and they have been allowed since only to preserve the living for the patron himself, or for a child, or to restrain the incumbent from non-residence or a vicious course of life ; and if any other advantage be made thereof, it will avoid the bond : and where it is general for resignation, yet some special reason must be shown to require a resignation, or he would not suffer it to be put in suit. If it should not be so, simony will be committed without proof or punishment. A particular agreement must be proved to resign for the benefit of a friend who would be presented, and without such agreement the bond ought not to be sued, but for misbehaviour of the parson, and here are proofs in this case of endeavours to get money out of the plaintiff : and he decreed a perpetual injunction against the bond, and satisfaction to be acknowledged upon the judgment, and the plaintiff to give a new bond, of £200 penalty, to resign, but that not to be sued without leave of the Court."

It is difficult to say why there should be a new bond, the party intended to be presented being dead. And in *Ambler*, 268, the Lord

\* 2 Equity Cases abridged.

Chancellor is stated to have said, that the Lord *Keeper* went too far; but I cite the case to show that there was then no idea that a bond to resign, for a son or even a friend of the patron to be presented, was illegal; the only ground of applying to the Court of Chancery being the "ill use that had been made of it."

So in *Peele v. Capel*.<sup>\*</sup> Capel, on presenting Peele to a living, took a bond from him to resign when the patron's nephew came of age, for whom the living was designed. When the nephew was of age, instead of requiring a resignation, it was agreed between them all that Peele should continue to hold the living, paying £30 per annum to the nephew. Peele makes the payment for seven years, but refusing to pay any more, the patron put the bond in suit, and then Peele comes into the Court for an injunction, and to have back his £30 per annum. On the hearing the Chancellor granted the injunction, not (as he said) upon account of any defect in the bond itself, which he held good, but on account of the ill use that had been made upon it. And as to the money, it being paid upon a simoniacal contract, he left the plaintiff to go to law for it.

These are all the cases respecting special resignation bonds which I have met with before the decision of *Efytche v. The Bishop of London*. I proceed now to those which have arisen during the succeeding period of forty-three years. The first is *Bagshaw v. Batley*,<sup>†</sup> which was an action on a bond given by the defendant, on his appointment to the curacy of the free chapel of *Wormhill*, in the county of *Derby*, which, after reciting that the defendant had agreed to be constantly and duly resident at the curacy house there: and in default of such residence, to resign and deliver up the curacy within one month after request or notice in writing left at the curacy house, so that the patron might present anew, was conditioned for such resignation in default of such constant and due residence, so that the patron, the obligee, might present anew, discharged of all charges and incumbrances done and suffered by the obligor, and for the not committing wastes or dilapidations upon the houses or lands belonging to the curacy. To this the defendant pleaded several pleas: 1st. That he had resided at the curacy, and had not committed or suffered wastes or dilapidations. 2dly. That after his appointment to the curacy, he had a general license from the obligee to reside elsewhere. Replication: 1st. That the defendant voluntarily absented himself from the 7th day of April, 1790, to the 8th of April in the year following, and that the plaintiff had given him notice to resign, which he had refused to do. 2dly. That after the time when the supposed license was granted, viz. on 7th April, 1790, the plaintiff countermanded and revoked the license, and that the defendant absented himself, &c. as in the former replication. To both these replications there was a general demurrer. *Sutton*, in support of the demurrer, contended, first, that the bond was illegal and void; and secondly, that the license was general, and could not be revoked. First, the bond is illegal, because it placed the incumbent under the undue control of the patron, after the presentation, and after the relation between them had ceased, and a new relation had sprung up between the incumbent and the ordinary, to whom only he owed obedience. The right of presentation in

\* 1 Strange, 534.

† 4 Term Reports, 78.

the patron is a public trust, and not a mere private interest. The duties of the incumbent are prescribed by the municipal law, and the canons and ordinances of the church, and therefore it was not competent to the patron to impose any private condition of his own creating beyond those which the civil and ecclesiastical law have deemed it necessary to require. With respect to the residence required by the bond, that is carried much farther than the law requires it, for the statute of *Henry VIII.* only imposes certain penalties, much inferior to that imposed by this bond for non-residence: and besides, there may be various defences to an action on that statute, as amongst others residence upon another living by dispensation, whereas there can be no excuse under this unless the license of the patron be such. And further, in this case the living itself is to become vacant: again too in this case the penalty is to become due to the patron, in case of dilapidations, in which he has no sort of interest, that being but the sole concern of his successor. The effect, therefore, of this bond, is to raise to the patron a special interest in the exercise of a public trust, which by law he was not invested with.—*Chambre*, *contra*. was stopped by the Court.—*Lord Kenyon* said, I cannot bring myself to entertain a doubt upon this case. It has been argued that the patron's right of presentation is a mere trust; it is so to some purposes, but not to all. It is a trust coupled with an interest, for it is a subject of a conveyance for a valuable consideration, which is not the case with a naked trust. As soon as the defendant was presented to the living, he was bound to take upon himself all the duties of an incumbent; to reside upon the living, to take upon himself the cure of souls, and to keep the house in proper repair: now this bond was only entered into for the purpose of securing a performance of all these duties, which by law, and without the bond, he was bound to discharge. I avoid saying any thing respecting the case of the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*: when that question comes again before the House of Lords, they will, I have no doubt, review the former decision, if it should become necessary. It is sufficient for me, in deciding the present case, to say, that it cannot be governed by that, for here the plaintiff does not call for the resignation of the incumbent, but merely for a performance of those duties which in morality, religion, and law, he ought to do. I am therefore clearly of opinion, that a bond for the performance of these duties is not illegal.—Justice *Buller* said, I cannot find any immorality or illegality in this bond. It is the duty of the incumbent to reside on his living, and to be regular in the discharge of his duties. Now this requires nothing more: it only requires him to do what the law would have compelled him to do without it." Justice *Grose* was of the same opinion. *Ashurst* was absent.

Although in this case the bond was not for resignation to the patron, or to any relation, on his becoming capable and desirous of taking it, yet it amounts to a decision of the Court, that the giving of a special bond of resignation is not in all cases illegal.

The next case was precisely in point with the present. It is *Partridge v. Whiston*.\* The condition of the bond, after stating the presentation of the defendant to the rectory of *Cranwick* and the vicarage of *Methwold*, in *Norfolk*, recites an agreement to be personally resident in one or other

\* 4 Term Reports, 359.



of these parishes, or in *Northwold*, which is contiguous to both, without absence for eighty days in any one year: to serve the cure of these two parishes himself, if his health would permit; and not to serve the cure of any other parish while he held those: that as the two livings together were a comfortable provision for one clergyman, though neither of them separately was such, the defendant had agreed never to resign one without the other: that the plaintiff had a son about fourteen years of age, who probably would take orders, and might be desirous of taking these livings; and therefore the defendant had agreed in that event to resign both the livings upon three months' notice to be given by the plaintiff, in order that the plaintiff's son might be presented thereto: the bond was conditioned to perform this agreement, and to keep in good repair the rectory house and chancel of *Cranwick*, and the vicarage house of *Methwold*. The Court, understanding that it was intended to carry this case up to the House of Lords, gave judgment for the plaintiff, without hearing any argument. They said, as this case was not precisely similar to that of the Bishop of *London v. Efytcbe*, they were bound by the established series of precedents to give judgment for the plaintiff. I do not find that the case was ever carried further.

The next case is not one for a resignation bond with respect to an ecclesiastical benefice, but I cite it for the purpose of showing the opinion of Lord *Kenyon* on the point now in question. It is the case of *Legh v. Lewis*,\* where the patron of a school had taken a general resignation bond on the appointment of the master. Lord *Kenyon* said, in the instance of ecclesiastical livings, every rector has a freehold in his rectory; yet it was never doubted but that resignation bonds for certain purposes, and up to a certain extent, at least, were binding, though they put an end to the freehold.—Justice *Lawrence* doubted whether the appointment could be made otherwise than for life; but he says it is true that a bond may be taken to enforce the observance of those duties which by law are required to be performed by the appointee of an office, but then it should be so expressed in the condition.

In 3 *Bosanquet and Puller*, 231, this case is reported in the Exchequer Chamber, and judgment affirmed without argument, it not sufficiently appearing on the record that the office of school-master was such as ought to be deemed a freehold office.

In *Newman v. Newman*,† upon a bond to pay certain sums of money on the conveyance of an estate, having an advowson appurtenant, to the obligor; and in case a living should become vacant during the life of the son of the obligee, and he should be qualified, to present him; and if he should be under age, and it should be necessary to present another, to procure such other to resign when the son should be of age; it became unnecessary to decide whether the latter part of the condition was good.—Justice *Le Blanc* says, the reason for making an exception in favour of a condition for presenting a son might be because it was not for a money consideration.—Justice *Dampier* says, if a bond to resign in favour of a particular person were necessarily void, the objection would have been good in *Johnes v. Lawrence*; but a stipulation to resign in favour

\* 1 East, 391.

† 4 Maule and Selwyn, 66.

of a specified person, does not seem to be open to the same objection as if it were to resign generally, because the latter makes the incumbent but a mere tenant at will to the patron. I know that since the case of the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, it has been considered that bonds to resign in favour of specified persons are not illegal.

In *Lord Kirkcudbright v. Lady Kirkcudbright*,\* a bond was given to pay £100 a year until the obligee should be instituted and placed in possession of a living in the Church of England, then to pay him so much as with the value of the living shall amount to £150. There was also an agreement by *Lord Kirkcudbright* to enter into orders and take the living, and if he did not the bond was to be of no avail. The obligor having died intestate, the obligee filed a bill praying an account, and that the arrears of his annuity might be paid him. "The Lord Chancellor expressed great doubt as to the validity of the bond: observing, that it was void on many accounts; it is," he says, "a corrupt agreement for taking holy orders such as the Court ought to decree to be delivered up. The policy of the Ecclesiastical constitution of the country requires, that a man should take orders without any reference whatever to considerations of that nature. There is no objection to the bond itself except as connected with this agreement at the same time for a pecuniary consideration to take holy orders. Another objection to the bond is, that the father is put under these circumstances, that he is to solicit the benefit of patronage for this pecuniary consideration moving from himself; the policy of the law supposing the patron to look for persons the best that can be recommended to him, which excludes pecuniary considerations. The cause stood over in order that this point might be considered. It was ultimately decided that the obligee had not performed the conditions, inasmuch as he had only taken deacons' orders, and had not answered whether he meant to enter into priests' orders. That case contains no decision upon the validity of special resignation bonds, though the Lord Chancellor, speaking of resignation bonds in general, states himself to have no doubt that they were generally against the policy of the law, and says, that the question of their legality would never have perplexed him if there had not been so many authorities.

Another case has been referred to in the argument,† where a bond of resignation had been given in favour of a particular individual and not to accept a bishopric. The application was for an injunction, principally on the ground that the bond as to the resignation which had been given in consequence of supposed directions in a will, had been so given by mistake, it having been afterwards discovered that it was intended by the testator that the party should be presented without any such obligation. The Lord Chancellor said, it was very difficult, upon the pleadings in the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, to reconcile the distinction between general and particular bonds of resignation with the principle on which the House of Lords made that decision; but, he adds, "it would not however become me, having regard to what is the present state of the law on this subject, to interpose in a court of equity on the ground that this is a particular bond of resignation, although I agree that this court, if it

\* 8.Ves. 51.

† *Dashwood v. Peyton*, in 18 Ves. 27.

has a concurrent jurisdiction, is not bound to wait for the decision of a court of law, yet reasonable caution requires a court of equity not hastily to pronounce bad a bond understood to be good at law, and it would at least be proper to leave that question to be reconsidered at law. The injunction was refused.

The last case to be found on the subject is *ex parte Rainier, Rowlatt v. Rowlatt*\*. The father, on the marriage of his son, gave a bond to trustees, *inter alia*, for performance of a covenant in the settlement, whereby he covenanted, that until the son should become the actual incumbent of the rectory of *North Benfleet*, or should be in the enjoyment of some other benefice or ecclesiastical preferment which he might hold during his life, of the yearly value of £600 at the least, or until his death, he would pay him an annuity of £200. The father became a bankrupt; the petition was presented by the son and his trustees to prove in respect of the bond. It appeared that the son had been presented to a living of £600 a year, but had given a bond to resign in favour of two sons of the patron, when either of them should be qualified and willing to be presented to it, and instituted and inducted. The eldest son took orders, and the living was in consequence resigned within two years after the presentation. It was contended, that the son having been presented the condition was satisfied; on the other hand, it was said, that having been presented on a condition to resign and a bond given to that effect, it was a benefice that could not have been retained for life. The Lord Chancellor said, still he might have held it for life, he might if he chose have kept the living and forfeited the bond; you may, however, if you like, take a case into the court of King's Bench. The reporter says, the matter stood over for the plaintiff to consider whether they would take a case, which they afterwards accepted, but it is understood that they have since declined to persevere in it.

I apprehend that case could only have been directed upon the ground that the court of King's Bench might have held the bond legal; for if it was simoniacal, the party could not have held the living, even if he had paid the penalty. For the presentation would have been absolutely void, and consequently not a satisfaction of the condition.

I have now gone through all the cases I can find respecting special resignation bonds, extending over a period of above 200 years; in none of which has such a bond been held bad; in many it has been expressly determined to be good, and admitted to be so in most of those in which validity of general bonds of resignation has been disputed or denied. In one or two of the latest cases, indeed, in the court of Chancery, it has been stated to be very difficult upon the pleading in the case of the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, to reconcile the distinction between general and particular bonds of resignation with the principle on which the House of Lords made that decision. The main principle upon which the decision proceeded, appears to me to have been the enabling the patron to have made a greater profit on the sale of the advowson, and the converting the tenure of the incumbent into a tenancy at will. This I have already stated not to be applicable to the case of a bond to resign in

\* 1 Jacob and Walker, 230.



favour of a particular person. The only objection applicable to a special in common with the general resignation bond appears to be the reducing the tenure from an absolute freehold for life to one for a less period, but however that might be available if the objection had been made for the first time, the practice as to special bonds appears to have been too long acted upon and acquiesced in now to call it in question.

Under these circumstances, therefore, can a court of law now adjudge that they are bad; particularly when it is considered that the consequence of holding them to be so must be to submit to severe penalties those who have been acting upon a practice of upwards of two centuries, and which has never yet been declared illegal, and in many instances expressly determined to be legal? Those penalties, if the bond be considered as illegal, under the statute of Elizabeth, extending to the forfeiture of the presentation and two years' value of the benefice.

The provisions of the statute apply "to any person, &c. who shall present or collate for any sum of money, reward, gift, profit, or benefit, whatsoever, directly or indirectly, or for or by reason of any promise or agreement, grant, bond, covenant or other assurance of or for any sum of money, reward, gift, profit, or benefit, whatsoever." It is not contended that this case comes within any of the words of the statute except the word *BENEFIT*, and it is said that a resignation bond in favour of a son is a benefit to the father, inasmuch as it relieves him from making any other provision for him, which he would otherwise be bound to do. To this I answer, that this is not the species of benefit which the statute contemplated. A general resignation bond may be so, as I before stated, as it enhances the value of the living if sold during the incumbency, and amounts to a sale with the means of procuring an immediate vacancy. But if this be so considered, it would be equally a benefit when the father presents the son on a fair vacancy, or even where he presents himself; in either case it may be said he makes the presentation a means of providing for an expenditure he must necessarily incur; and therefore, circuitously, at least, a source of profit to himself. The statute has never yet been intended to operate to that extent; and the observation made at the bar, that upon looking at the 8th section the word benefit must be taken to mean a pecuniary benefit, and that the two clauses ought have a similar construction, appears to me to be entitled to considerable weight.

It might perhaps be urged, that in this case it does not appear that the patron was bound to provide for his younger brother, and therefore it can be in no sense a benefit to the patron, which it is but fair to consider the meaning intended by the statute to be applied to the word *benefit*, coupled as it is with the words sum of money, reward, gift, or profit. But it seems to me to be sufficient to say the act has never been held to extend to bonds of this description; that, on the contrary, they have been uniformly held good in Westminster hall, and that it would be contrary to the principle universally acted upon with respect to penal law, viz. that they are to be strictly construed, now to extend it to them.

But it is asked, admitting a resignation bond in favor of a son to be good, to what degree of relationship and to what number of persons is it to extend? To this I answer, that it must, like many other cases, depend

upon what shall be considered reasonable. With respect to the present case, such a bond, in favor of a more remote degree of relationship than a brother, has been held good; for in the case of *Pcele v. Capel*, before cited, the bond was in favor of a nephew; and in *Rowlatt v. Rowlatt*, where the bond was in favor of two sons, when either of them should be qualified, no objection was taken on that ground; but, on the contrary, a presentation, accompanied by such a bond, was considered as a satisfaction of the condition to pay an annuity until the party should be in the enjoyment of a benefice which he might hold for his life. It is also to be observed that the statute of *Eliz.* is not confined to bonds and securities, but extends to any promise, agreement, grant, bond, covenant, or any other assurance. If therefore the bond in this case is illegal, and avoids the presentation, the same rule applies to every verbal promise or honorary engagement, expressed or perhaps only implied, surely then it is necessary to pause before a decision is adopted, which may, in its consequences, involve, in the guilt of simony and the penalties of the statutes, parties, than whom none would be more abhorrent from such an offence, into whose contemplation it could never for a moment have entered that they were acting illegally, in making or accepting resignations, under circumstances sanctioned by the practice of centuries and the current of legal decisions, and who, from their peculiar station in society, would have been the last to have put themselves in the smallest hazard of having it imputed to them for an instant, that they had concurred in or lent their sanction to any act, of the legality or propriety of which a doubt could be entertained.

Another objection taken to these bonds, is the oath taken upon institution, but this seems to me to be begging the question. The oath is—"I do swear that I have made no *simoniacal* payment, contract, or promise." Now, before the giving of such a bond can be considered a breach of the oath, it must be determined that such a bond is a *simoniacal* contract. Bishop *Gibson*\* contends that this oath, whether interpreted by the plain tenor of it, or according to the language of former oaths, in the notions of the catholic church, concerning simony, is against all promises whatsoever; and he states that in the year 1391, in Archbishop *Courtenay's* decree against choppe churches, the oath is—"Quodque obligati non sunt nec eorum amici pro se juratoriâ aut pecuniariâ cautione de ipsis beneficiis resignandis vel permutandis." But I should conclude, by the omission of this part of the oath in the canons of 1603, it was intended that it should no longer be included, or at least that it was considered as not being included; for in the Irish canons, which were made thirty-one years afterwards, it was provided that if any clerk or other, with his consent, should seal any bond, or sell to any person or persons, with condition of resignation of his benefice, he shall be holden guilty of simony, and proceeded against according to the severity of the ancient canons in that behalf.

As another ground of objection to these bonds, it is asked what power is there after the resignation made, to compel the patron to present the person in whose favor it is made, or to compel such person to accept it,

\* Codex, p. 802.

or having been instituted, to prevent his resigning the benefice to a vendee immediately afterwards? and it is said that neither the Bishop nor the Chancellor can compel such presentation to be made. To this I answer, that the resignation is to be made to the Bishop. Upon its being tendered, he has a right to inquire into the reason of it, and upon finding it is the consequence of a resignation bond, or any other engagement to resign, he may say he will not accept the resignation, unless the patron comes at the same time prepared to make the presentation: where the party who presented is under age, at the time when the engagement is entered into, and as soon as he comes of age procures himself to be admitted into priest's orders, it is a pretty strong proof of his readiness to accept the living. With respect to the second part of the offer to resign the living immediately, or within a very short time after institution, is a pretty strong proof of the resignation being obtained from an interested motive, and would probably induce the Bishop not to accept it. But the legality or illegality of the bond cannot depend on what course the Bishop would pursue, and the probability is that he would not refuse to act according to what the courts of law had decided upon the question. If any real inconvenience should be found, it would be in the power of the legislature to enact that the resignation shall be conditional only, and be void if the persons in whose favor it is made be not presented within a certain period. It certainly has been determined that the party does all he can to comply with the condition, by tendering his resignation; yet if the Bishop refuses to accept it, the bond is forfeited. But upon this I would observe, that if where the incumbent has done all he can to perform his obligation, the bond is still put in suit, it can only be for an unlawful purpose: in that case I apprehend a court of equity would grant an injunction.

To the observation that it may be difficult or impossible to ascertain the fact; the answer is, that if there is any suspicion respecting it, a Bill in Equity may be filed for a discovery, and if the discovery does not render the party liable to penalties, it will be ordered. This was done in the case of the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, and it is remarkable, that the noble and learned lord, who so ably, and so successfully, combated the legality of Resignation Bonds, while he was in the profession, adopted the doctrine of *Westminster Hall*, and had, in that very case, over-ruled a demurrer which had been pleaded, on the ground that a discovery might expose the parties to penalties, and which must have been allowed, had his lordship then been of opinion that the transaction was illegal.

I have cautiously abstained from entering into the question, how far bonds of this description are or are not consistent with public policy; and I have done so, because however proper, if the case were new and doubtful, it might be to take this question into consideration, yet if the case is not new, but such bonds have been held good for centuries, as it appears to me they have been, it is now too late to consider that question in a Court of Law, and if it is considered right to put a stop to them on the ground of public policy, the legislature are the pro-

\* 1 Brown's Reports in Chancery, 96.



per persons to do so. Were the case new, I am not prepared to say it might not be proper to prevent the giving of these bonds; but if so, it seems to me that it would be the proper course to put an end to them altogether, and not to make a distinction in favour of those which it has been said are good because they only enforce the performance of those duties which are required by law to be performed. If the law requires the performance of a duty, why not trust the enforcing such performance to those authorities to which the law of the country has entrusted it, and who have the power of determining how far any regulations for the rigid performance may or may not be relaxed or dispensed with? Why is it necessary to call in the assistance of the patron, and give him the power of enforcing it by a more severe punishment than the law would inflict, and the inflicting of which would confer an advantage on the patron, which the ordinary process of the law would not give him.

With respect to one of the cases in which a bond of resignation has been allowed, namely, that of non-residence, I am not sure that the case stated upon that subject, does proceed from so pure a motive as has been attributed to it. Take for instance, the case of *Whiston v. Partridge*, before cited. The condition is, that the party shall reside, without absence of eighty days in *any one year*. When it is considered that at the period when this bond was entered into, absence of eighty days in the course of any one year put an end to any lease which might have been made of the tithes, or any part of the benefice, one is compelled to conjecture that there was some other reason for the insertion of that provision, than the good of the church, or the punctual performance by the incumbent of the duties of his situation.

I forbear, however, to say more upon this topic, because, as it appears to me, the practice of giving these bonds has too long prevailed, and has been too often recognized as legal, to permit it to be altered by any other than legislative authority. For these reasons, and upon the most attentive and full consideration I have been able to give to the authorities, I feel myself bound to state my humble opinion:—That sufficient matter does not appear upon the record to show that either by the statute or common law, the bond upon which the action of the Defendant in error was brought in the court below stated upon the Record to bear equal date with the Writing of Presentation therein mentioned, is void and illegal.

*Mr. Baron Hullock.*—After much reflection and research upon the subject, I have arrived at a different conclusion from that which is the result of the deliberation of my learned brother. But I concur in the opinion which has been stated, and which I have reason to believe is the opinion also of all the learned Judges now present; that this record discloses sufficient matter to show, that the Bond in question was given in consideration of, and as the price of the Presentation of the Plaintiff in error to the Rectory of Kettering. For a considerable time I felt much difficulty on this part of the case; because, although no plain unlettered man can peruse the condition of this bond without, as it seems to me, at once perceiving that such was the fact; yet still it appeared to me to be

doubtful whether that conclusion was more than an inference which, however well warranted in ordinary cases of construction, was yet insufficient, in the absence of distinct and positive averment, to warrant a Court of Law in acting upon it, in a case where the question is, whether the parties to the contract have acted in contravention or violation of the enactment of a penal statute. In all cases in which the charge involves in it a breach or violation of a penal statute, it is essentially necessary that the act charged should be brought by express and positive allegations within the language and letter of the statute. I apprehend that if the defendant below had, in this case, been advised to have pleaded specially, instead of suffering judgment to go against him by default, his plea would have shewn by precise and positive allegations, that this bond was given in consideration of and for and as the price of the presentation, and that the presentation was made or conferred in consideration of and in return for the bond. A plea so framed would, if established in point of fact, have brought the case directly and unequivocally within the language of the statute.\* Further reflection, however, and opportunities of conversing upon the subject, have satisfied me, that it is clear, from the language of the condition itself, that this bond was given in consideration of and for the presentation, and that the presentation was made in consideration of the bond: in short, that this instrument was the result of barter and contract between the obligor and the obligee, for and in respect of this living.

The condition of the bond commences with a recital, that the obligee is the patron of the rectory of Kettering, which rectory was then vacant by the death of the late incumbent thereof—That the obligee, by writing under his hand and seal, bearing equal date with the bond, had presented the obligor to supply the said vacancy, and to be rector, in order that he might be instituted and inducted thereto; and that the obligee had agreed to resign the said rectory, upon such request or notice as thereafter mentioned, so as that the said rectory might thereby again become vacant, for the sole purpose, that the owner of the advowson of the said rectory might be enabled to present thereto one of two brothers of the obligee, therein specifically named, when the party to be presented should be capable of taking an ecclesiastical benefice.

Now can any person, after reading these passages, from the condition of the bond, have a doubt of the nature and character of this contract? Assuming, then, that it is sufficiently evident, by the matter appearing on this record, that the bond in question constituted the consideration for this presentation, is it an instrument avoided by the statute?† By the fifth section of that statute, “If any person shall or do, for any sum of money, reward, gift, profit, or benefit, directly or indirectly, or for or by reason of any promise, agreement, grant, bond, covenant, or other assurance of or for any sum of money, reward, gift, profit, or benefit, whatsoever, directly or indirectly, present or collate any person to any benefice, with cure of souls; or give, or bestow, the same for or in respect of any such corrupt cause or consideration; that then every such presentation, and every admission, institution and induction thereupon,

\* 31 Eliz. cap. 6. sec. 1. 5.

† 31 Eliz.

shall be utterly void and of no effect in law." And the Act then proceeds to subject the parties to certain forfeitures and incapacities.

By the word "Corrupt," as used here, and as applied to this subject, it is quite clear, that every presentation, which is not gratuitous, is corrupt. By the former part of the clause, presentations, for money, &c., "are prohibited; and, by the latter part of this section, presentations, made for such corrupt cause, are avoided; clearly considering such cause, that is, a bond, &c., made for the presentation, to be a corrupt cause. And the statute was intended, (as appears by the preamble to the fifth section, which is printed incorrectly, at the end of the fourth,) for the avoiding of simony and corruption in presentations to benefices, &c.

It may be observed, that the statute does not in express words avoid the bond itself, but merely the presentation made in consequence of or under it. But still, upon general principles of law, I conceive it to be quite clear, that a bond made for the purpose of furthering an object prohibited by a statute is void, and can never be made the foundation of an action: and this doctrine is laid down in the clearest manner, by Lord Holt, in *Bartlett v. Viner*.\* In that case, that learned Judge expresses himself thus: "Every contract, made for or about any matter or thing, which is prohibited and made unlawful by any statute, is a void contract; though the statute itself doth not mention that it shall be so, but only inflicts a penalty on the offender; because a penalty implies a prohibition, though there are no prohibitory words in the statute: as, for instance, in the case of simony, the statute only inflicts a penalty by way of forfeiture, but doth not mention any avoiding of the simoniacal contract; yet it hath always been held, that such contracts, being against law, are void."

The inquiry, then, will be, whether a bond of this description be a benefit, either directly or indirectly, to the patron; because, if it be, it will fall immediately within the words and operation of the statute; and any presentation made for such a bond will be void.

It is denied that this security is either a profit or a benefit in the true spirit and intendment of this clause of the statute.

If the judgment of the Court below is sustained, the obligee would be entitled to take out execution upon his judgment for the sum of £12,000, with his costs of suit. A right to enforce the payment of such a sum of money looks like a profit, like a benefit, it appears difficult to raise a serious doubt upon the question. The opportunity afforded by this species of bond of providing for a son, or a brother, or relation, must surely be considered a benefit to a patron. If it be a benefit, how has it been acquired? why by means of a corrupt bargain for the presentation.

But consider this contract in another point of view. It is not compulsory on the obligor to resign, he has an option either to do so or to pay the penalty, and, as has been well observed by *Eyre*, B.† in the *Bishop of London v. Fytche*, "Is the chance that the obligor (who may) will so elect worth nothing to the obligee? The obligor may resign or pay the money, and the obligee cannot, at all events, compel him to resign. If that be so, what would be easier than the making of this spe-

\* Carth. 252.

† Cunningham, 52.



cies of contract the means of selling an advowson during an actual vacancy? The value of the living is calculated,—a bond is given for the amount, conditioned to be void if the incumbent resigns on request, when a certain specified individual has become capable of taking the living. That event happens almost immediately by the nomination of a person who, if he lived, would, within a very few months, become capable of holding an ecclesiastical benefice. The incumbent is called on to resign: he refuses, but prevents a suit on the bond by paying to the obligee the amount of the penalty. Would not such a proceeding, if this bond be legal, operate a benefit to the patron for and in respect of his presentation; but whether the money or the resignation of the living is obtained, the obligee acquires to himself a benefit in every sense of that word for his presentation.

It has been however argued, as it was said in the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche*, that the word “benefit” in the 6th section of the 31 *Eliz. c. 6.* cannot be construed according to its ordinary meaning, inasmuch as such a construction would have the effect of rendering the 8th section of the statute nugatory. The true answer to that sort of reasoning is given by Mr. Baron *Eyre* in the case of the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche*. It appears to me that the word “benefit” in the 8th section of the act must receive the same meaning as it possesses in the 6th clause of the act. The word “benefit” in the 8th section means something ultra, something in addition to the value of the thing exchanged. In exchanges neither living can be considered as better or worse in legal intendment, because they are, in the estimation of those that make them, perfectly equal, however other persons may differ upon the subject. Mr. Baron *Eyre* puts the case thus: “A living in the air of Berkshire may be reckoned an equivalent for the difference in value of an incumbency in the Hundreds of Essex.” That is a fair argument. Each man throws into the scale circumstances which establish a perfect equilibrium in cases of exchange between parties. In a case where there is not a single shilling passing, if there is any other extrinsic benefit whatsoever to the smallest amount, it is made a part in the consideration of such exchange, and there is no question that upon this act of parliament such exchange will be void. Since the decision in the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche*, we are bound to say that a general bond of resignation is bad in point of law. That decision must have proceeded either on the ground that such a bond was a benefit to the patron, and therefore prohibited by the statute, or that such a bond was void on grounds of public policy. It was contrary to the policy of the law to permit the incumbent of a living to be placed under such a controul as must necessarily result from such an instrument. In *Leigh v. Lewis*, 1 East, 398, Mr. Justice *Le Blanc* says, that the decision in the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche* against the validity of general bonds turned ultimately on the ground of their being simoniacal and against the statute. If the decision alluded to proceeded on that ground, then I would humbly ask, on what principle or ground of reason can the effect of the bond now in judgment be distinguished from the effect of a general resignation bond? The benefit or value of the two bonds may differ in amount or degree: a special bond may not be so

beneficial or so valuable as a general resignation bond, but that is a mere difference in the degree, not a difference in the nature, or essence, or character of the instrument. I am unable to comprehend any other way in which a difference can be predicated between these two descriptions of bonds. No ingenuity, no subtlety that can be employed on the subject, can succeed in establishing any other distinction between general and special bonds of resignation; and if the facts disclosed upon this record are adverted to, the absolute identity of these bonds in principle and operation will be most palpable. One of the nominees in the bond is now competent to hold an ecclesiastical benefice. But the patron cannot be compelled by any mode or way which any lawyer can point out, to make the request or give the notice mentioned in the bond. That being the case at the commencement of the suit below, the obligor stood precisely in the same situation as an obligor in a general bond would be in the moment after he had executed that description of bond.

If, then, general bonds of resignation were decided to be bad, as being contrary to the statute of *Eliz.* on the ground of their operating as a benefit to the patron; it seems to me more than difficult to contend with success, that a special bond, operating in the same way, can be supported as an efficient instrument. If both species of bonds operate as benefits to the patron, though not to the same extent in point of value, they still must operate equally in violation and contravention, of the provisions of the statute.

But it has been argued, that, admitting the case of the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche* to be law, yet, inasmuch as it was decided, as it has been strenuously alleged in direct contravention of a long train of decisions in the Court below; that case ought not be carried beyond the strict letter of the decision, and that, therefore, your Lordships will restrict its operation to general bonds of resignation merely.

In confirmation of this view of the subject, it is said these special bonds of resignation have been holden valid and unimpeachable at several times, and by several judges, and in several decisions in the Courts below, since, and notwithstanding the determination in the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche*. It cannot be dissembled, that, since the decision so often referred to, resignation bonds with special conditions have been treated on several occasions as legal instruments in the Courts below. It may be, therefore, material to advert to the modern cases in which this question has been agitated, and it will be found, and it is a most singular fact, that in no case since the determination in the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche*, has the construction of the statute of *Eliz.* ever been the question before the Court.

The first case of which I am aware in which the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche* is mentioned is, *Bagshaw v. Batley, Clerk*;\* that was a bond given by the incumbent to the patron on presentation to reside on the living, or to resign it if he did not return to it after notice, and also not to commit waste, &c. in the parsonage-house, and it was held good. In giving judgment, Lord *Kenyon* said, "this bond was only entered into for the purpose of securing a performance of all those duties, which by

\* 4 T. R. 78.

law, and without the bond, he was bound to discharge." He then proceeded thus: "I avoid saying any thing about the case of the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche*; when that question comes again before the House of Lords, they will, I have no doubt, review the former decision, if it should become necessary. It is sufficient for me to say, that this case cannot be governed by that." Mr. Justice *Buller* said, "I cannot find any immorality or illegality in this bond. It is the duty of the incumbent to reside on this living, and to be regular in the discharge of his duty. Now this bond requires nothing more. It only requires him to do what the law would have compelled him to do without it."

The next case is *Partridge v. Whiston, Clerk*;\* that was an action of debt upon a bond conditioned:—to reside; to resign for the patron's son to be presented; and to keep the premises on the living in repair. In that case the defendant pleaded two pleas to the bond; and the question now before your Lordships might, as it would seem, have been raised on the first special plea, which set out the condition upon oyer; and this in effect averred, that the presentation was given in consideration of the defendant's entering into the bond to resign the living upon the plaintiff's son taking priests' orders. To this plea there was a demurrer and joinder. But the Court, understanding that it was intended to carry the case up to this House, gave judgment for plaintiff without argument. They said, as this was not precisely similar to the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche*, they were bound, by the established series of precedents, to give judgment for the plaintiff. In this case, therefore, the construction of the statute of *Eliz.* is never once thought of.

The next case to which I call the attention of your Lordships, though not in order of time, is that of *Newman v. Newman*.† That was debt on bond, conditioned:—to pay money to the obligee upon the conveyance of an estate to the obligor, and to present the obligee's son to the next avoidance of a church, the advowson of which belonged to the estate, if he were then of age to take it, or if not to procure the person who should be presented to resign, upon notice of the son's being qualified to take it, and to present him. These facts appeared on oyer of the bond, and were alleged to be simoniacal; there were a demurrer and joinder; and the Court decided that, as the bond was conditioned for the performance of several things, some of which were good, the bond was valid, although one of them might be void at the common law; after argument Lord *Ellenborough* said, "What the effect of a bond of resignation in favour of a son might be, was not, I believe, touched upon in the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche*, though, perhaps, it might be argued that there is no reason for any distinction, because a parent would be more open to prejudice and improper bias in favour of a son than of any other person." Mr. Justice *Le Blanc* said, "The reason for making an exception in favour of a condition for presenting a son might be, because it was not for a money consideration."

Mr. Justice *Dampier* said, "A stipulation to resign in favour of a specified person, does not seem to be open to the same objection as if it were to resign generally, because the latter makes the incumbent a mere

\* 4 T. R. 359.

† 4 Maule v. Selwyn, 66.



tenant at will to the patron. I know that since the case of the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche*, it has been considered that bonds of resignation in favour of certain specified persons are not illegal.\* In this case, the judgment is given on that part of the condition of the bond which was holden good, and no judgment was given on the part of the record applicable to this question, and the opinion of Lord *Ellenborough* seems rather against the validity of special bonds of resignation as not distinguishable from general bonds. Mr. Justice *Le Blanc*'s opinion proceeds entirely on the ground of a special bond of resignation not being for a money consideration, and therefore not bad. But the statute law is not confined to money considerations. Mr. Justice *Dampier* seems to consider special bonds good; but his reasoning is equally applicable to both descriptions of bonds; and if his reasoning be correct, this bond is bad, because clearly here the obligor is at this moment tenant at will, &c.

In *Legh v. Lewis*,\* this species of bond was touched upon, though not the point in judgment. That was the case of a bond given by a school-master, of an ancient public school, who had, as it was said, a freehold in his office, to resign at the request of his patron; the Court held the bond good. The question arose upon a demurrer to a plea which after oyer stated all the facts on the record. In giving his judgment Lord *Kenyon* says, "I never can admit that at common law, a general resignation bond of an office is illegal, although a party may have a freehold in the office. In the instance of ecclesiastical livings that is universally the case, every rector has a freehold in his rectory, yet it was never doubted, but that resignation bonds for certain purposes and up to a certain extent at least were binding, though they put an end to the freehold." Mr. Justice *Lawrence* expressed great doubts on this question. Mr. Justice *Le Blanc* agreed with Lord *Kenyon*, that the bond in that case was good; he thought it fell within the principle of the former determinations, that general bonds of resignation were good at law. I shall, however, have occasion to advert again to this decision.

I am not aware of any other case upon this subject. From this review of the modern cases, it is quite impossible to say that any question concerning the validity of special bonds of resignation has ever come neatly before any of the Courts below, with the exception of *Partridge v. Whiston*, in which a formal judgment was given in support of such a bond without argument, for the purpose of a writ of error. What became of that case I do not know.

It has been seen then that no well grounded argument in support of a special bond of resignation can be drawn from modern cases: and it will be found, I believe, that the more ancient ones are equally destitute of general reasoning on the subject. If any one will take the trouble of toiling through the old cases in this matter, he will not, I believe, find any decision in which the validity of either species of bond has been discussed or argued on general reasoning, either on the statute or common law.

For these reasons, therefore, it appears to me that I ought to answer the question proposed to the judges in the affirmative; that sufficient

\* 1 E. 391.

matter appears upon the record to show that by the statute law the bond in question is void and illegal. But assuming that the decision in the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche* proceeded on the ground that the bond in that case was void, as being contrary to public policy, although it might not be a benefit within, or contrary to, the provisions of the statute of *Elizabeth*, I am disposed to maintain, that the bond in this case operates equally against public policy, and is therefore on that ground equally void and illegal.

Bonds of this description had no existence at the common law, because it was not until a period long subsequent to legal memory that the right of patronage, in the manner in which it now generally obtains, had its origin; but still these bonds, if they operate to the prejudice or detriment of the public interests, are contrary to the common law, inasmuch as every bond or contract which operates against the public convenience, or to the public prejudice, is, upon the principles of the common law, void and of no effect. This doctrine is familiar to every one, and is recognized and illustrated in the case of *Collins v. Blantern*.\*

If no authorities could be found on the subject; if the question were *res integra*, few persons, I think, would contend that this species of instrument given in consideration of and for the presentation to an ecclesiastical living, is capable of being supported on sound principles of law.

Before the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, numerous cases occur in the books upon the subject; but no one of them, as far as my researches enable me to speak, contains any reasoning or argument in support of these bonds. The authority of these cases seems to depend mainly upon tradition; certainly more upon positive authority than good reasoning. In the latter cases, the judges, whilst they seem to admit that if the question were new, the validity of these instruments could not be supported, decide upon authority merely, and refuse to hear any argument upon this subject.

In 12 Mod. 504. 13 W. 3. P. Mr. Justice *Powell* expressed an opinion against resignation bonds, if the authorities had not bound him. He says, that when first the judges held these bonds good, if they had foreseen the mischief of them, they would have been of a contrary opinion. The same opinion is expressed on this subject by Mr. Justice *Buller* in the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, when that case came before the Court below;† and afterwards, when that case was before your Lordships, the same learned judge says, that he had taken no small pains to find out upon what principle all the cases had gone, but without much effect; for after all the labour he had bestowed upon the subject, it seemed to him they were destitute of all sense, reason, and principle. And in *Legh v. Lewis*,‡ Mr. Justice *Lawrence* says, speaking of general resignation bonds, it must be admitted, that if it were a new question at this day, it would be very difficult to say upon principle, that such bonds could be legal, and an opinion in accordance with those to which I have just adverted has been oftener than once expressed by the highest living authority. On several occasions the noble and learned Lord to whom I allude has expressed himself unfavourable to those bonds upon principle.

\* 2 Wils. 343.

† 1 East, 494.

‡ 1 Est. 396.

He has declared, that the only perplexity he has experienced on the question has arisen from the authorities. No one who has taken the trouble of wading through the cases which are to be found in the books upon the subject of bonds of resignation will, I think, be disposed to question the accuracy of the conclusion at which Mr. Justice *Buller* states himself to have arrived from a perusal of those cases. That learned judge declared, that the cases appeared to him to be destitute of all reason, sense, and principle. Your Lordships are, however, vehemently called upon to found your decision upon the present occasion on the authority of such cases.

With respect, however, to general bonds of resignation, the more ancient cases no longer exist as authorities upon the subject, and upon what view of the subject can either the ancient or modern cases be considered as authorities in support of special bonds of resignation? I would ask, upon what principle can a special bond of resignation be sustained, I mean with reference to public policy? It may be worth while to advert for a moment to the nature and extent of the estate and interest which a rector has in point of law in his rectory after institution and induction.

Few lawyers will be disposed to deny that by institution and induction a rector becomes seised of a freehold estate for his life in the parsonage house, the glebe, and the tithes of his rectory. The authorities are numerous and uniform on the point,\* and distinctly stated by Lord *Kenyon*, in *Legh v. Lewis*, and by Lord *Thurlow* in the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*.

In pleading, which is the best evidence of the law, a rector states that he is rector, &c. and as such rector that he was, and thence hitherto hath been and still is seised in his demesne as of freehold, in right of his said rectory of, and in the tenements, &c., and being so seised, &c. If a rector, by virtue of institution and induction, acquires an estate for life, from whom does he derive it? not from the patron, but from the ordinary. The patron has purely the right of nomination or presentment. That is the whole of the *jus patronatus*. The office is not in any sense conferred by the patron; it proceeds entirely from the act of the bishop. Then, upon what principle can it be justified at common law, that the patron shall be permitted to exact a security in derogation of this freehold estate, the effect of which will be the converting a life estate into an estate at will. In the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, Lord *Thurlow* asks whether a bond of resignation, given by a judge or a master in Chancery, would be good. He says a master in Chancery is an officer appointed for life. Suppose the Chancellor has the appointment, and suppose such master gives a bond to resign when called upon, would that bond be good at common law? No, because it is not only contrary to the constitution of his office, but because the public has an interest in the independence of that officer, as being appointed for life, and a public law officer. His place is independent, it being *quam diu se benè gesserit*. If he is an officer for life, how can any private man whatsoever, because it is his province to appoint him, take upon him to render that officer's

\* Wils. 347. Gibs. 661. Cro. Jac. 337. Noy, 104.



situation what the law says it shall not be? He apprehended it would be extremely difficult to justify those bonds. This reasoning is applicable *à fortiori* to bonds like those now under consideration; and the difficulty of supporting a bond of resignation, which, in effect, reduced a freehold office to a mere estate at will, is adverted to by Mr. Justice *Lawrence*, in *Legh v. Lewis*.\* I have already had occasion to observe, that that was the case of a bond of resignation by a schoolmaster. There Mr. Justice *Lawrence*, after observing that it did not precisely appear on the pleadings, whether the office was a freehold office, says, that he had considerable doubts on the question, how far the person, who has the power of such appointment, could exercise it in a different manner from what the founder intended.

It may be added, that when the case of *Legh v. Lewis*† came on for argument afterwards, on a Writ of Error in the Exchequer Chamber, the Court were clearly of opinion, that it did not sufficiently appear on the record, that the office of school-master was such an office as ought for the sake of the public, to be deemed a freehold office; and that therefore it was impossible to raise the important question which it was the intention of the parties to litigate, upon which question they declined giving any opinion. Hence it may be collected, that in a clear case of a freehold, (like the present case,) the invalidity of such a bond was considered, by the Court, a question of great difficulty and importance: and the difficulty of establishing a bond to resign a freehold office, at the instance of the person making the appointment, is suggested in *Laying v. Paine*.‡ That case, it is true, arose on the statute of 5th and 6th *Edw. 6. c. 15*, against the sale of offices; but still the language of the Lord Chief Justice is extremely applicable to this subject. He says, “I think this is a void condition (a condition to resign the office of Registrar of the Archdeaconry of Wells); for the donor to oblige the officer to surrender whenever he requires it, is to reserve to himself an absolute power over his officer, which he ought not to do: besides, if this were allowed, there would be a plain method chalked out to evade the statute; for any one, by this means, might sell an office for its full value; and such indisputably would be the consequence of supporting the present bond.”

In *Newman v. Newman*,§ in speaking of a special bond of resignation, Mr. Justice *Dampier* observes, that such a bond does not seem to be open to the same objection as if it were to resign generally, because the latter makes the incumbent but a mere tenant at will to the patron. Now if that reasoning be sound, it applies directly to the facts disclosed on the record. It is averred, that one of the nominees in the bond has become capable of taking an ecclesiastical benefice, of consequence the time has arrived at which the obligee may call for a resignation, according to the condition of the bond; but the obligee is not, therefore, obliged to take that step; he may do so, or he may let it alone. If that be so at the time of the commencement of the action in the court below, the obligor was a mere tenant at will to the patron. If he be allowed to retain the living, he would do so by the permission of the patron, and

\* 1 East. 396. † 3 Bos. and Pul. 231. ‡ Wils. 571. § 4 Maule and Selw. 71.

he would hold it on the tenure of the patron's mere will and pleasure. Can any one, then, seriously contend that the condition of this bond, which places the incumbent in such complete thralldom, under so absolute a dominion and restraint, can be supported upon any known or recognized principle of law? The inevitable consequences of such a state of things are too palpable and gross to be dwelt upon for a moment. Such a bond must necessarily operate to the prejudice, if not the total subversion, of the true and essential interests of religion.

Suppose the clerk should resign in conformity to the condition of a bond of this sort, what obligation is there upon the obligee to present the individual specified in the condition? None. He may give the living to a stranger; and if the patron should present a stranger to the living, would the obligor have any remedy, either at law or in equity, against the obligee, for the nonpresentation of the nominee in the bond? I should be curious to learn the precise species of remedy or redress, to which an obligor would, under such circumstances, be entitled. Again, there is no obligation upon the nominee to accept the living if it should be offered to him.

How can a clerk, after entering into a bond of this description, honestly take the oath which is administered to him previous to institution? \* how can he sign his resignation in the form usually adopted?† If the ordinary permit him to resign, (which by the way he is not bound to do). The words of resignation, according to Gibson,‡ are “*ex certa scientia pure sponte simpliciter et absolute resigno.*”

If the acceptance of the ordinary be necessary to give effect to the resignation, the undertaking of a clerk to resign a benefice is an undertaking which he has no power of himself to perform, because it depends on the ordinary, whether he will accept the resignation or not.

Another objection arises, on the ground of general policy, to this species of instrument; the patron becomes thereby precluded from choosing the most proper individual for supplying the living. If he act in the presentation according to the condition of the bond, his choice is fixed long before the fitness of the object can be ascertained. At the execution of the bond the nominee may be at college, or perhaps at school, or perhaps in his cradle.

Numberless other objections might be pointed out to this species of bond; but having already occupied too much time, I will conclude by stating it to be my opinion that this bond is void and illegal.

The old cases, as to general bonds of resignation, were overturned by the final decision in the case of *The Bishop of London v. Ffytche*; and as there is not, as far as I am able to comprehend the subject, any rational distinction between the two descriptions of bonds in their operation and consequences, I conceive that special bonds of resignation are equally destitute of principle and authority. I therefore am bound to say that, in my judgment, sufficient matter appears upon the record to show that, by the common law, this bond is void and illegal.

\* Gibs, 802. 810.

† Ib. 1518.

‡ Ib. 851. 1518.

*Lord Chief Justice Best.*—'The question is, "Whether sufficient matter appears upon the record to show that, either by statute or common law, the bond upon which the action of debt was brought in this case, and stated upon the record to bear even date with the writing of presentation therein mentioned, is void or illegal? I will not detain the House by any technical observations on the point, whether the supposed objection to the bond be raised by the pleadings in this cause, because I am of opinion that, if it had been expressly stated on the record that the plaintiff in error was presented to the living of *Kettering* on the condition of his giving a bond to resign, to the intent and for the sole and only purpose (in the language of the bond) that the defendant in error might be enabled to present one of his younger brothers, when such brother should be capable of being inducted into such living, the bond would not have been void, either by the statute or common law. But for the judgment of this House in the case of the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche*, I will venture to say there never was a lawyer, from the time when tithes were first granted the church to the present, that would not, without hesitation, have given the same answer. It is now, however, thought by some of my learned brothers, that resignation bonds in favor of particular persons, although sanctioned by judges, bishops, and chancellors, are void, that the condition of resigning benefices is repugnant to the estate which incumbents have in them, and therefore bonds containing such a condition are void by the common law; that such bonds are benefits to the patron, and subject the givers and takers of them to all the penalties of the statute for the prevention of simony; that they cause the ministers of the Gospel to take false oaths, and are therefore not to be endured in a Christian community.

My Lords, although I most sensibly feel the weight of the authority to which my humble opinion is opposed, yet, supported by two of my learned brothers, I am vain enough to think we shall satisfy your Lordships that such bonds are liable to none of these objections. The judgment in the Bishop of *London* and *Ffytche* has not decided, nor did the House intend, in that case, to decide this question; but it has been insisted, in argument, that the principle which that case establishes, governs this. My first duty will be to show, that that case establishes no principle that, by fair legal reasoning, can be applied to the present. I have not, therefore, to express the hope which Lord Kenyon expressed, \* that your Lordships will review that decision, I have only to request that the principle on which that judgment rests may not be extended further than those who pronounced it intended it ever should be, and that it may not be applied to cases which cannot be productive of the evils which it was their object to remedy. Thus much I might ask, although disposed to admit what has always appeared to me repugnant to reason and authority, namely, that a supreme court of justice cannot undo what it has erroneously done. Although the courts below will not impugn your Lordships' judgments, in cases *ad idem*, yet they do not hold that they are bound by them beyond the point actually decided. The Courts below truly say, we cannot know that the House of Lords would carry this determination

\* 4 Term Reports, 81.



farther than they have carried it. In the case of *Partridge and Weston*,\* the Court of King's Bench said, "that a bond to resign in favour of the son of the patron did not raise a point precisely like that in the Bishop of *London* and *Ffytche*, and they were bound, by the established series of precedents, to give judgment for the plaintiff." This decision, although pronounced on a point appearing on the record, and therefore liable to be disputed in this House, was never disturbed.

In the Bishop of *London* and *Ffytche*, the point decided was, that a presentation was void which was made in consideration of a bond given by the presentee to the patron, by which the former bound himself to the latter, absolutely to resign the living on request made to him by the patron to make such resignation. The question in this case is, whether a bond given by the presentee to the patron, to perform an agreement made between them, that the former would resign the living to the latter, to the intent, and for the sole and only purpose, that the latter might present one of his brothers when such brother shall be capable of taking an ecclesiastical benefice, is valid.

The reverend prelates, who favoured the House with their opinions in the case of the Bishop of *London* and *Ffytche*, although they expressed doubts of the legality of bonds in any form or under any circumstances, confined their judgments to general bonds, and all their reasoning went to prove the impolicy of general bonds only. The Bishop of *Bangor* says, "I am inclined to think that bonds of resignation, whether the condition be special or general, are within the express letter of the statute of Elizabeth, because it is impossible to conceive how a presentee can, in any instance, give a bond of resignation to a patron from which the patron will not derive some benefit or reward directly or indirectly." This is but an inclination of opinion, not a decided judgment; and I would beg to observe, that if the principle of some benefit, direct or indirect, be adopted, (a principle altogether inconsistent with the legal construction of penal statutes,) many most conscientious patrons, as well ecclesiastical as lay, have committed the detestable crime of simony. The Bishop of *Bangor* says, "if a bond of any sort can be said to be without exception." Except these expressions of dislike of any bonds of resignation, all the observations of the reverend prelates are directed against general, and general bonds only. The Bishop of *Salisbury* says, "general bonds of resignation have usually been given, and from the instant they are given, the wretched presentee is taken from under the protection of that law which guards every other subject of the state. He ceases to be free, because he holds his living at the absolute will of his patron, subject to his caprice." The Bishop of *Bangor* (except in the passage before cited) speaks always of general bonds: "Suppose," says his Lordship, "that the patron presents a clerk to a benefice without receiving any money-bond or assurance for money, but the clerk enters into a bond to resign on six months notice. As soon as he is in possession, the patron demands a lease of certain tithes at an under-rent." His Lordship sums up his argument by saying, "the worst and most corrupt practices may be carried on under general bonds of resignation." The Bishop of *Landaff* speaks of

\* 4 Term Reports, 360.

general bonds only. The Bishop of *Gloucester* says,\* “a bond which conceals the consideration for which it was given, and which may easily be abused to the most oppressive and iniquitous purposes, affords a strong suspicion of a bad design. If the consideration were a good one, why is it not expressed, as in special bonds it always is, in plain words?” Although these learned prelates, from a proper regard for the independence of the clergy and a jealousy of what they thought interfered with the authority of their order, disliked all resignation bonds, yet, it is clear, that they only decidedly condemned general bonds. The Bishop of *Gloucester* distinctly admits not only the legality but the propriety of some special bonds of resignation.

The reasoning of *Lord Thurlow* goes only to impugn general bonds; nobody (he says) contends that the practice is not wicked, destructive, and pernicious to the discipline of the church, and contrary to the spirit of the law under which it was carried on. He could produce evidence of an offer to sell an advowson, upon which the purchase money was calculated, and put on a general bond of resignation (no such arrangement could be made on a special bond): and he knew that instances of it were frequent.† Your Lordships are aware that *Lord Thurlow* had recently changed his opinion. When the Bishop of *London* and *Ffytche* came before him in the Court of Chancery, that learned Lord said, If there were no cases, I should think it clear that a mere bond for resignation could not be criminal, unless it were a profit or benefit to the patron. Many cases have determined that these bonds were good: the effect of the determination is, that they are not simoniacal, nor against the policy of the law.‡ His Lordship’s argument in the House of Lords, so far from proving that bonds to resign in favour of a son or a brother, (which no reasonable man could say are wicked and pernicious to the discipline of the Church, and could be made use of to enable sales of benefices,) are illegal, shows that general bonds of resignation, although under circumstances voidable in Chancery, are not void at common law. He says, “The bond is not capable of being avoided but by averments of bad considerations and use, if you cannot aver upon in that manner, whatever the Canon Law may do with it, by the Common Law it cannot be rescinded.”§ His Lordship then compares them to marriage brokerage bonds, and says, “abundant cases may be put to show that it is impossible to avoid those bonds at law,” and refers to the case of *Hall v. Potter*, decided in this House, in confirmation of his opinion. If I understand this argument, it is not that every general bond is void at law, but that it may be avoided if a bad use be made of it. *Lord Mansfield* says, “The case stands singly on this proposition—whether an agreement by a general bond of resignation, in consideration of a presentation, was by 31 *Eliz.* simoniacal, corrupt, and void.” I hope I have clearly shown, from the pleadings, the questions put to the Judges, and the opinions of the Judges and Members of this House, that the question now submitted to us by your Lordships, is not touched by the judgment in the Bishop of *London* v. *Ffytche*. It has been stated that special bonds differ only in form from

\* Page 151.

† *Cunningham*, 156.

‡ 1 *Brown*, 98.

§ *Cunningham*, 158.

general bonds; that the condition to resign may be in favour of such as are neither the children nor relations of the patron; that if the names of two persons may be introduced into such bonds, the names of any greater number of persons may be inserted. Put into a special bond as many names as you please, you can no more make it, in form or substance, like a general bond, than by adding equal to unequal numbers you can make the totals equal. You cannot by a special bond reduce the incumbent to the same state of dependence on the caprice of the patron, as by a general bond; you cannot render it available to accomplish the sale of a benefice as you can a general bond. If a living be vacant, it cannot be sold; but if general bonds were permitted, the patron might present to the vacant benefice, take a general bond of resignation from the presentee, and when he has got his price for the benefice, call on the incumbent to resign, and thus, as Lord *Thurlow* says, he may calculate the purchase money on a general bond of resignation. The patron cannot make this calculation on a special bond, even if he be not obliged to present on the resignation of the incumbent the person mentioned in the bond, and on whose behalf the resignation is called for. If a special bond can be made use of to evade the penalties of the statute of *Elizabeth*, the taking it for such a purpose, if properly pleaded and proved, would render it void, and the insertion of an unusual number of names, and those persons not connected with the patron, would be evidence of such an intent.

I am not prepared to say that the persons in whose favour resignations are required must be relations of the patron. He may honestly think that a person who, from temporary infirmity, or absence, or from his not yet being in orders, is incapable of being presented to the living, will, when the disability shall be removed, be the fittest person to fill the church. But I think, that a patron may be compelled to present the person for the purpose of presenting whom he calls on the incumbent to resign; and that he may thus be prevented from making an improper use of the power given him by the bond; as my brother *Gaselee* has said, the Bishop may refuse to accept the resignation until he has in his hands the presentation of him in whose favour the resignation is required, or the incumbent may make a conditional resignation; such conditional resignations have been made where livings have been exchanged. *Sir Simon Degge* gives us the form of such a resignation, in which the Bishop is expressly required not to admit the other clerk, unless the exchange be completed, but to consider that resignation as of no effect. This agrees with the Common Law. Lord *Coke* says, "If two exchange lands, and one die before the exchange is executed, it is void." There are several instances in which Courts of Equity have interfered to prevent the making an ill use of these bonds. No case is to be found of an action at law; but as the loss of a benefice is the loss of a temporal advantage, otherwise the Court of Chancery could not have interfered, I should think that there could be no doubt that if a patron called on an incumbent to resign his benefice to the intent and for the sole and only purpose that he might present A. B., in favour of whom the patron had a right to call on the incumbent to resign, and after having obtained the resignation by such false pretence, he presented C. D., for whom the bond



did not authorize the patron to require a resignation, compensation for the injury the incumbent had sustained might be recovered in an action. If such an action be not maintainable, a man may, through fraud, sustain a temporal injury, and yet have no redress, which, I apprehend, would be inconsistent with the first principles of our law.

Although the validity of general bonds was supported in a great number of decided cases, there were some in which it was doubted, and others in which they were declared to be illegal. Lord Keeper *North* said he was not satisfied that such bonds were good in law: and in the case of *Graham v. Graham*, such bonds were holden to be within the statute of *Elizabeth*, by the Court of Common Pleas, in the 15th. of *James I.* Where authorities clash, a Court of Error, at the same time that it confirms some judgments, must overrule such as are contrary to them; but where there is a long series of decisions, no authority can be opposed to them. I think a Court of Law cannot overturn them. The legality of special bonds is supported by decisions, both in Common Law Courts and Courts of Equity, from the time of *Henry IV.* to the present. In *Johans v. Lawrence*, it was recited on the bond that it was the intention of the obligee to preserve the presentation for his son, when he should be capable of taking the living; the obligor bound himself to resign within three months after request: the King's Bench first, and afterwards the Court of Exchequer Chamber, held, that a bond to resign on request, if the patron will present his son thereto, when he should be capable of taking the living, is good. This is the decision of all the Judges of England in the 8th of *James I.* Lord *Coke* was then Chief Justice of the King's Bench, and in his reading, on the statute of *Elizabeth*, he says that he was in parliament when that act passed; that he voted with the proceedings of the House, and he concurred with the other Judges that such a bond was valid. Can your Lordships have so safe a guide to lead you to the true meaning of the statute as one of the most eminent lawyers that ever lived, who took a part in the making the law—knew the evil that parliament meant to correct, and the exact extent to which it was intended the remedy should be carried? In *Hilliar and Stapleton*, Michaelmas, 1707, the Lord Keeper said, "Resignation bonds have been allowed since the statute only to preserve the living for the patron himself, or for a child, or to restrain the incumbent from non-residence, or a vicious course of life." If the bond be general, his Lordship observes, a particular agreement must be proved to resign for the benefit of a friend that would be presented, and without such agreement the bond ought not to be sued on.

In *Pull and Capel*, 9 Geo. 1. the bond was to resign when the patron's nephew came of age: instead of the patron's requiring a resignation, an agreement was made that *Pull* should hold the living paying the nephew £30 a year. This payment was made for several years, but was afterwards refused, and the bond put in force. The chancellor granted an injunction, but said it was not on account of any defect in the bond, which he held good, but on account of the use that had been made of it.

In an *Anonymous* case in 13 W. 3. *Powell, J.* concurred with *Blencow*, the only other judge in court, in supporting a general bond, because, he

says, it may be to an honest intent, as that the patron may have a son of his own capable of taking the benefice ; but, says he, if this was the real motive, why should it not be expressed in the condition. This very learned judge entertained no doubt of the legality of special bonds or of the justice or policy of allowing them. In *Partridge and Weston* the Court of King's Bench said they were bound by an established series of precedents to give judgment for the plaintiff in an action on a bond on a condition to resign in favour of a son of the patron. This case might have been carried to the House of Lords, for the question was raised on the record, but the judgment was never disputed. To these decisions no judgment of any court, no *dictum* of any judge, can be opposed. The overruling of so many authorities by any power but that of the Legislature will destroy entirely the certainty of the law—no man can know what are his rights or duties.

We talk much of national faith, I hope, my Lords, it will ever be kept inviolable. ; national faith is not, however, confined to any particular compacts, it requires the strict observance of all laws under the sanction of which any of the subjects of this empire have acquired any rights. The reversal of these decisions would be a breach of national faith to those who have been induced by them to purchase advowsons ; for immense sums of money have been expended in buying advowsons and presentations upon the highest assurance next to that of an express declaration by the legislature, that in case of livings becoming vacant before those on whom the purchasers intended to bestow them are capable of taking orders, they might present to such livings and take the security of a bond from the presentees for the resignation of them when the person for whom they are intended shall be in priest's orders. Many of these purchasers have no other provision for their children but the living so purchased. Ecclesiastics, as well as laymen, have dealt in these bonds of resignation. Lord *Mansfield* says, a bishop of Salisbury, before his (Lord *Mansfield's*) time, frequently took them. This is not said of that right reverend prelate by way of reproach, but to show that men of the highest character did not consider that the taking such bonds was improper.

Your Lordships will permit me to remind you, that if you decide that these bonds are within the statute of Elizabeth, you make those who have given, and those who have taken them, criminals. Both the plaintiff and the defendant in error, and many other persons, as well clergymen as laymen, have, whilst acting under the sanction of the courts of Westminster, committed the scandalous crime of simony, and subjected themselves to all the penalties of the statute of Elizabeth. I am aware, my Lords, that this argument was answered in the Bishop of London v. *Ffytche*, by saying, that these consequences of the judgment could be prevented by an act of parliament ; your Lordships cannot have forgotten the answer of Lord *Mansfield* to this observation : " What ! pass a judgment to do mischief and then bring in a bill to cure it ! " I will add, will you condemn men by a judgment that has all the vice of an *ex post facto* law, and after confiscating their property, save them from further punishment by a statute pardon ? But let us forget for a

moment that there are any decisions on the subject. The statute of Elizabeth cannot be holden to embrace this case without setting aside rules that since the Revolution have been uniformly observed by all judges, and which tempers with mercy the justice of our criminal law. The statute of Elizabeth is a penal law: the rule to which I allude requires that all penal laws should be construed strictly; that no case should be holden to be reached by them but such as are within both the spirit and letter of such laws. If these rules are violated, the fate of accused persons is decided by the arbitrary discretion of judges, and not by the express authority of the laws. If general words follow an enumeration of particular cases, such general words are by another rule of construction holden to apply only to cases of the same kind as those which are expressly mentioned. By the 14th Geo. 2. c. 1. persons who should steal sheep or any other cattle were deprived of the benefit of clergy. The stealing of any cattle, whether commonable or not commonable, seems to be embraced by these general words "any other cattle." But by the 15th Geo. 2. c. 34. the legislature declared, that it was doubtful to what sorts of cattle the former act extended besides sheep, and enacted and declared, that the act was meant to extend to any bull, cow, ox, steer, bullock, heifer, calf, and lamb, as well as sheep, and to no other cattle whatsoever; until the legislature distinctly specified what cattle were meant to be included the judges felt that they could not apply the statute to any other cattle but sheep. The legislature by the last act says, it was not to be extended to horses, pigs, or goats, although all these are cattle. Lord Chief Baron Comyn says, "A penal statute shall not be extended by equity, and the general words of a penal statute shall be restrained for the benefit of him against whom the penalty is inflicted."

By the 31 Eliz. c. 6. s. 4. "for the avoiding simony and corruptions in presentations, collations, and donations, of and to any benefices, dignities, prebends, and other livings and promotions ecclesiastical, and in admissions, institutions, and inductions, to the same, if any persons or person shall for any sum of money, reward, gift, profit, or benefit, directly or indirectly, or for or by reason of any promise, agreement, grant, bond, covenant, or other assurance, of or for any sum of money, reward, preferment, gift, profit, or benefit whatsoever, directly or indirectly, present or collate, any person to any benefice with cure of souls, dignity, or living, ecclesiastical, the presentation, collation, gift, and bestowing, and every admission, institution, investiture, and induction, shall be utterly void, frustrate, and of none effect in law, and the person giving or taking the money &c. shall forfeit double the value of one year's profit of the benefice, and the person accepting the benefice shall be for ever disabled from holding the same." The only words in this statute that can be so far stretched as to reach the bond which is the subject of the present action are "profit or benefit;" but these, according to the restrictive rules of construing penal statutes, mean only profits or benefits *ejusdem generis* with money, rewards, or gifts, such as bills of exchange instead of money, leases of the tithes or profits of the benefice, or loans of money, or other valuables, for a long or indefinite period of time, instead



of immediate gifts of the same things. If this construction be not put on the words no patron either lay or ecclesiastical can present or collate a son who is dependent on such patron to any preferment in the Church without being guilty of simony. If a bond for the resignation of a living in favour of a son be a benefit; the presentation of a son to a vacant benefice must be a benefit, for the first is only a means of obtaining the second. Indeed, there can be no doubt that if a patron has a son whom he maintains, it is generally a benefit for him to have a living to which he can present such son; for few persons would allow a son as much after he was in possession of a benefice as he received before. But this was not that corrupt benefit which was contemplated by the legislature when this statute was passed. Whatever expressions are to be found in the act, the object of the legislature was only to prevent simony, and such advantages as these were never thought to be simoniacal.

Lord Chief Justice *De Grey* says, in 2 *Blackstone's Reports*, 1052, the statute has not adopted all the wild notions of the canon law with regard to simony, but the giving or granting this bond would not amount to simony even by the canon law; the words which approach nearest to it are those of the canon of 1229:—*Nulli licet ecclesiam nomine dotualitatis ad aliquem transferri*: all the other canons are confined to the trafficking in presentations and preventing the granting of leases and pensions by incumbents. One definition of simony by a canonist is, *Studiosa voluntas emendi vel vendendi aliquod spirituale vel spirituali annexum*. This definition can by no construction be extended to special bonds of resignation made to enable a patron to provide for his relation or friend. Another writer has defined simony to be *Spiritualium acceptio vel donatio non gratuita*. This word *gratuita* is used as an opposite to *oneraria*, and only applies to a corrupt bargain for money or other direct property. In exchanges each party proposes to himself some benefit, the one expects to get more profit, the other a more healthy, or agreeable, or advantageous residence; yet exchanges are expressly allowed by the statute of *Elizabeth*, because exchanges, though productive of temporal advantages to one or both parties, are not the vile corrupt contracts which were intended to be prohibited by the legislature.

But it has been said by one of my learned brothers this is a benefit and profit, because by means of it money will be obtained; for if the judgments of the courts below should be confirmed, the defendant in error will get £10,000. The performance of the condition of all bonds is enforced by pecuniary penalties, and which pecuniary penalties may, in the event of a breach of the condition, be recovered. This is the case when bonds are given for the faithful performance of any office; yet, such bonds have been enforced over and over again, and no such objection was ever made to them. If the intent of the obligee was to obtain the penalty of the bond, and not the resignation of the living, such intent would be corrupt, and the bond made to carry it into execution would be void; that would not be a resignation bond but a money bond, all that was said about resignation being a mere colour to cover the corrupt intent. But this corrupt intent not appearing on the face of the bond, must be pleaded. There is no such plea in the present case, nor is there the least reason

to suspect that the defendant in error ever contemplated so mercenary and so base an object. He expected that the obligor would perform the condition of the bond, and then no money or other corrupt benefit could have been offered.

Is it consistent with justice or common sense that a man is to lose his right, because his opponent compels him, by a breach of his contract, to sue for a penalty which he neither expected nor desired? Mr. Justice *Heath* says, in *Efytche* and the Bishop of *London*, "The law construes bonds according to the intent of the parties, and in all bonds with a condition the penalty is only considered as enforcing the condition." So, my Lords, although a patron can derive no pecuniary advantage from the presentation to a living; yet if his clerk be not admitted, the law permits him to recover damages in a *quare impedit*. It has been insisted that advowsons are pure trusts, and that patrons, in the execution of these trusts, have no right to consider their families or adopt any means for reserving presentations for any of their children or relations. This opinion is founded on what Lord *Coke* says, that "a guardian in socage does not take a presentation to a living, because he cannot make money of it." This doctrine has led to the ridiculous ceremony of the guardian putting the pen into the hands of an infant in the cradle, and guiding its feeble hand while it signs a presentation. But executors and administrators of lay patrons present to livings that have become vacant in the life times of their testators or intestates. Presentations are not pure spiritual trusts: if they had been so considered, the bishops could never have allowed them to be disposed of by laymen;—advowsons in gross or next presentations could never have been permitted to be sold;—archbishops could not leave option to their widows or other lay persons. The learned *Selden* calls the right of lay patrons to present to church livings, "the interest of patronage which the lay founders challenged in their new erected churches." Lord *Kenyon* calls a right of presentation "a trust connected with an interest." The founders of lay patronage when they endowed the churches reserved the right of patronage and the right of taking resignation bonds in favour of their children and descendants. The bishops, by allowing the dedication of tithes to be made on these conditions, obtained a provision for many churches that would otherwise have remained without endowment. As the bishops were to decide on the fitness of the persons to be presented, they wisely thought that the allowing patrons the privilege of taking such bonds could not injure the church. On the contrary, from the exercise of this privilege the younger members of the families of great land-owners were brought into the church, and a connexion has been kept up between the landed interest and the church, which greatly contributes to increase the security and influence of the latter; at the same time the members of great families are generally better educated, and from those family connexions likely to be more respected in their parishes, than any other clergymen that can be found. The practice of taking special resignation bonds, and the sanction that such bonds have uniformly received from the courts of Westminster, are the highest evidence that such bonds were allowed by the original compact made

between lords of manors and the bishops, when churches were founded. These were some of the interests which *Selden* says the patrons challenged in their new erected churches. It has been said that a clerk, who has given one of these bonds, cannot subscribe the proper form of resignation, or take the oath administered on his institution. The unhappy men who have taken this oath, and resigned in consequence of bonds of resignation, have been charged with perjury. This, my Lords, is a dreadful charge against the thousands of worthy persons who have given such bonds, and honourably performed the conditions of them. The objection as to the form of resignation assumes, that the words *sponte, pure et simpliciter* are an essential part of the instrument of resignation. There is no particular settled form of words necessary in a resignation. Neither these words, nor any thing of the like import, are in the form of resignation given by *Degge*.

But if a resignation in this precise form were required, the only import of the words *sponte, pure et simpliciter*, is that the clerk was not driven by unlawful violence or threats, or seduced by any corrupt agreement, to make the resignation; but that he made it willingly and because he thought it his duty to make it. With regard to the oath, I admit that, by Archbishop Courtney's decree, persons presented are required to swear that "*obligati non sunt nec eorum amici pro se juratoria aut pecuniaria cautione de ipsis beneficiis resignandis.*" These words are not in the oath prescribed by the Council of Westminster, 1138, or that of the Council of Oxford, 1236; the insertion of them by the Archbishop into the oath required by his decree shows that he and those who advised him thought that the oaths previously taken did not reach resignation bonds. The archbishop had no authority to alter the oath, and if any bishop was now to refuse to admit a clerk who declined taking this oath, he would render himself liable to damages and the costs of a *quare impedit*. By altering oaths of office, you may alter the condition, duties and responsibilities of the officers. Parliament only can do this, in civil offices; and councils of the clergy, with the approbation of the king, in ecclesiastical. Lord Coke says, "a new oath cannot be imposed without the authority of parliament." In 1603, a canon was made prescribing a form of oath to be taken by persons presented to benefices, and this canon was confirmed by the king. The clergy who assisted at the convocation which made the canon must have known of Archbishop Courtney's decree, and yet they have omitted in the form of oath the words relative to bonds of resignation. How is this omission to be accounted for? why, either the clergy or those who advised the crown thought that bonds of resignation if not abused were legal and proper, and therefore they would not allow any oath to be administered to clerks which should prevent them from giving such bonds.

I have heard it said, why will not patrons rely on the honour of clergymen? My Lords, if the clergy cannot give bonds, they cannot pledge their honour. If the one is a violation of their duty inconsistent with the forms of resignation and their oaths, so is the other. The last objection to the validity of these bonds is, that they convert an estate for the life of the incumbent into an estate determinable on a particular



event during the life of the incumbent. Supposing that the clergyman's interests in his benefice be exactly the same as that of a lay tenant for life, there is nothing in the objection; for the condition to resign in the case of a benefice, forms no part of the instrument that creates the interest in it: it is made by a separate deed. Now, my Lords, if a tenant for life were to give a bond to convey back his estate on the happening of a particular event, such a bond would not be voidable in law.

The objection is, to introducing into the instrument conferring the estate, a condition that is inconsistent with it; as when a deed conveys to B. an absolute indefeasible estate for his life, and contains a proviso on a certain event, that estate shall determine in the life-time of the party to whom it is given: your Lordships will perceive there is more of technicality than reason in this distinction. But no two estates are less like each other than that of a clerk in his benefice, and a lay tenant for life; they are created with different objects, conditions are annexed to one which are not annexed to the other; the clergyman, to preserve his estate, must perform the duties of his church. If he takes another benefice, without a dispensation, he vacates the first. These conditions are by the original compact between the leaders of the church and the clergy that I have already referred to.

My Lords, I humbly hope that I have proved, that the judgment of this House in the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche* does not bear upon the question now to be decided by your Lordships, that no principle can, by any just legal reasoning, be deduced from that case that is applicable to this. That securing a benefit for a brother or friend, is not a *profit or benefit* within the meaning of the statute of Eliz. That these general terms must, according to the true and established rules for construing penal statutes, be restrained by the particular words that precede them, and holden to mean any benefits of the same sorts as those particularly specified. That the taking of these bonds is not an abuse of the right of patronage, as that right stands according to the common law; and that they are not inconsistent with the estate which incumbents have in their benefices. That these bonds appear to have been used from the earliest times both by ecclesiastical and lay patrons, and have been uniformly supported by the judgments of the Courts of Westminster. That the consequences of declaring these bonds void, will not be confined to the injury done to the long established rights of patrons. It will be in a laxity in the mode of construing penal statutes that will deprive persons accused of crimes of the benefit of that humane rule, which secures from punishment all whose offences are not clearly within the letter as well as the spirit of the law. The judgments of the Courts of Westminster Hall are the only authority that we have for by far the greatest part of the law of England. The overturning the long series of judgments which declares the validity of these bonds, must introduce uncertainty and confusion into every branch of the common law. Can it be said, that the law which governs these bonds is unjust? No, my Lords, the injustice is in destroying, without compensation, a vested right. Can it be said, that they are inconsistent with the policy of our laws? That policy encourages us to provide for our children, relations, and friends,

and allows us to bestow on them offices for which they are duly qualified. In ecclesiastical benefices the public have a security for the fitness of the person presented, which does not exist in other cases: The bishops are to take care, that neither friendship, nor natural affection, puts a clerk into a church who is not duly qualified to do the duties of it. If a patron may give a living to his son, or relation, or friend, what objection is there, if it becomes vacant when the person for whom it is intended is incapable of taking it, to his permitting some other person to hold it until the incapacity of the first object of his choice be removed? It has been said this can be done in the case of no other office. There are no other offices that have been created by the patrons, and endowed out of their estates, and, therefore, there could be no legal origin for the right to take such bonds in any other offices. With respect to other offices, there are no judicial authorities to support such a right. Your Lordships will not suppose, that, by holding these bonds to be void, you will make patrons forget their faculties, and look out, unbiassed by affection or friendship, for the most worthy clergyman to fill the vacant benefice. Many of them will act, as some patrons have done, where a living, the presentation to which they are desirous of selling, becomes void before it is sold, that they will present some old man. By which are the duties of an incumbent likely to be best performed—a young man in full health, under a bond of resignation, or an old man, who has just enough of life left not to be liable to be objected to by a bishop on account of his imbecility?

Many owners of manors, with advowsons annexed, will sell the advowsons from the manors. Those who pay large sums of money to purchase advowsons in gross, will not be the most likely persons to hold such advowsons as pure trusts, and in disposing of them look only to the maxim *detur digniori*; such alienations of the church patronage will break the connexion between the landed interest and the clergy. The young men of family are, from their education and habits, likely to make the best parish priests; from their connexion with the owners of the lands in the parishes, all the inhabitants feel a respect for them, which must add much to the effect of the instruction they give. Connexion with proprietors of the soil gives to the clergyman the greatest interest in the happiness of his parishioners, and stimulates him to promote their spiritual welfare. Such persons will not take orders where the livings, which their ancestors founded, are severed from their families. I am aware these are rather considerations of policy than law. But, my Lords, if there be any doubts what is the law, judges solve such doubts by considering what will be the good or bad effects of their decision. I say nearly in the words of one of the bishops, in the *Bishop of London v. Efytcbe*, that doctrine cannot be law which injures the rights of individuals, and will be productive of evil to the church and to the community.

*Lord Chief Justice Abbott.*—My Lords, the question appears to me to consist of two parts:—First, whether enough appears on the record to show that the bond was given as the price or consideration of the pre-

sentation to the benefice?—Secondly, supposing this to appear, then, whether the bond is void by the statute or common law.

As to the first part of the question, I am of opinion, that enough does appear upon the face of the record to show, that the bond was given as the price or consideration of the presentation to the benefice. If the fact be manifest upon the face of the instrument, it is not necessary to aver it in order to bring it to the notice of the Court, or within the meaning of the statute, and that the fact does so appear it is only necessary to advert to the language of the condition.

In this case, my Lords, the statute mentions the act alone, without any epithet or qualification. The section commences with this preamble: “For the avoiding of simony and corruption in presentation, collations, and donations, of and to benefices, dignities, prebends, and other livings and promotions ecclesiastical, and in admissions, institutions and inductions to the same, be it enacted, That if any person shall or do at any time,” after such a period, “for any sum of money, reward, gift, profit or benefit, directly or indirectly, or for or by reason of any promise, agreement, &c. of or for any sum of money, reward, gift, profit or benefit whatsoever, directly or indirectly, present or collate any person, &c. to any benefice, that then such presentation be utterly void:” it is to that section to which I would beg to call your Lordships’ attention, from which it appears that the mere taking of any gift, profit or benefit, is in itself an avoidance of the presentation. It is necessary, with respect to any question that may arise upon the statute of *Elizabeth*, or any question that may arise on the common law, to see what the fact is, the question being, whether it is apparent upon the face of the instrument that the bond is given as the price of the presentation? It seems to me impossible for any person to read the condition of this bond, as it appears upon the record, without taking it that it was given as the price of the presentation, and that the presentation was given as the consideration of the bond.

It begins with reciting, that *Lewis Richard*, Lord *Sondes*, is the patron of the rectory, which rectory had become vacant by the death of the late incumbent. The next recital is, “That my Lord *Sondes*, by writing under his hand and seal bearing equal date with the above-written obligation, presented the above bounden *Brice William Fletcher* to supply the vacancy;” from which it appears, that the presentation and bond are connected together; and then it goes on, “And whereas the said *Brice William Fletcher* has agreed to resign the said rectory into the hands of the proper ordinary, upon such request or notice as hereinafter mentioned, so as that the said rectory may thereby again become vacant:” Can any person read this and not conclude that the presentation and the bond were concurrent acts?—that they were founded upon a prior agreement to resign? This was undoubtedly the opinion of Lord *Mansfield* in the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche*. That being so, my Lords, for the reasons which I have just given to your Lordships, I am of opinion that there is enough upon the face of the record to show that this bond was given as the price of the presentation.



Then, my Lords, the second inquiry which arises is, whether such a bond, given as the price or consideration of the presentation, is void in law? Upon this question I conceive the true inquiry to be only, whether this bond is within the rule and principle of the decision in the case of the Bishop of *London v. Ffytche*? I conceive, my Lords, that case to have established a rule and principle binding upon all jurisdictions except that of your Lordships' House. It is true that the question there arose directly upon the presentation, and not upon the bond; but it is treated throughout as being one and the same: as the presentation and the bond are the price and consideration of each other, it seems impossible to say that the one can be good and valid and the other bad and void.

That case, my Lords, arose upon a presentation, accompanied by a bond to resign upon the request of the patron; it was what is called a "general resignation bond." The present case arises upon a presentation accompanied by a bond to resign upon request, whereby and so as that the patron may be enabled to present one of his two brothers, in the condition named, when such of them as is to be presented shall be capable of taking an ecclesiastical benefice; the agreement having been, that the presentee shall so resign, to the intent that the patron may present one of those two persons. This therefore, my Lords, is one of those that have been called "special resignation bonds."

I consider, my Lords, the bond now in question to differ from the general bond in degree only, and not in principle or kind. If it be a benefit to a patron to be able to call for a resignation whenever he may choose to present any other person, it must in my opinion be a benefit, though perhaps a less benefit, to be able to command a resignation in order to present a relation or friend; and if there be any benefit, the degree of benefit must be immaterial, and the case will be within the statute. And if the law will not allow a benefice to be held absolutely at the will of the patron, and voidable whenever he may choose to present any other person, in my opinion the law cannot allow a benefice to be so held as to be voidable when a relation or friend of the patron may be capable of taking it and the patron may think fit to present him; for in each case the estate or interest of the incumbent will be less than a freehold, whereas a benefice is spoken of as a freehold in all our books, whatever it may have been in its origin or first constitution, all traces of which are now lost in the obscurity of antiquity.

But, further, it is not only required that a benefice shall be freely given and freely taken, but if resigned, it must be freely and voluntarily resigned; *non metu coactus sed spontanea voluntate*; and how can a resignation be voluntary which is made in order to avoid the penalty of a bond, whether a patron has a right to impose the penalty at his pleasure or only for a particular purpose? And ought the law to sanction an instrument that places a clergyman in a situation either to subject himself to a demand which he may be unable to pay, or to make a solemn declaration contrary to his conscience and to truth? In my opinion the law ought not to permit this.

Again, my Lords; the bond in question enables the patron to com-

mand a resignation in favour of one of his two brothers. If such a bond should be held valid, where is the line to be drawn, or what limit is to be fixed? If it be good in favour of brothers, why may it not also be good in favour of cousins or more remote kindred, or of friends? If it be allowed in favour of two persons, why may it not be allowed in favour of more than two—of twelve, of twenty, or even of a greater number? I am unable to discover any rule or principle upon which it may be said, “thus far shalt thou go, but no farther;” and I infer, therefore, that no step must be taken towards the accomplishment of an object which may reserve any benefit of this nature to the patron, or make the interest of the incumbent less than that freehold or estate for life, to be forfeited only for misconduct or by a regular judicial proceeding, which the law supposes him to possess and requires that he shall be permitted to enjoy.

For these reasons, my Lords, I am of opinion that enough appears upon the face of this bond to show that it is void and illegal.

---

We are compelled by want of room to omit the opinions given by the rest of the judges upon this important question. But it may be interesting to our readers to know, that the Lord Chief Baron, Mr. Justice Park, and Barons Graham and Garrow, pronounced the bond invalid, and that Mr. Justice Burrough pronounced it valid. The remaining judges did not deliver their opinions.

On the motion of the Lord Chancellor, the decision of the House was postponed till the present session.

STATE OF THE DIOCESES  
IN  
ENGLAND AND WALES,

FROM JANUARY TO MARCH, INCLUSIVE.

---

CANTERBURY.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. Edward Nares, D.D. Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford, and Rector of Biddenden, Kent, to hold the Rectory and Vicarage of Newchurch, Kent, by Dispensation under the Great Seal; Patron, the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Hon. and Rev. George Pellew, M.A. of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and Prebendary of Canterbury, to the Rectory of St. George, with St. Mary Magdalen, Canterbury; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of that Cathedral.

The Rev. William Pitman Jones, Curate of St. Andrew, and St. Mary Bredman, and Second Master of the King's School, Canterbury, to the Rectory of Eastbridge, Kent; Patron, the Archbishop.

YORK.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. Charles Musgrave, M.A. Vicar of Whitkirk, and Perpetual Curate of Roundhay, Yorkshire, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, to the Vicarage of Halifax, Yorkshire; Patron, the King.

The Rev. Mr. Croft, of Stillington, near York, to the Vicarage of Hutton Bushel, near Scarborough; Patron, E. Fitzwilliam.

The Rev. O. L. Collins, to the Perpetual Curacy of Osset; Patron, the Rev. J. Buckworth, M.A.

The Rev. Dr. French, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge, to the Rectory of Moor Monkton, near York; Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

The Rev. William Airey, M.A. of Queen's College, Oxford, to the Perpetual Curacy of Hexham, Northumberland; Patrons, Colonel and Mrs. Beaumont.

MARRIED.

The Rev. H. Torre, Rector of Thornhill, to Sarah Caroline, eldest daughter of Sir John Lister Kaye, Bart. of Denby Grange, Yorkshire.

The Rev. W. Tyler, of Keighley, Yorkshire, to Miss Dawes, of Mount Vernon, near Barnsley, in that county.

The Rev. J. Swindell, to Miss Cecilia Branton, third daughter of the late T. Sparkes, Esq. both of Aldborough.

The Rev. Joseph Jaques, of Cawthorne, to Ellen, second daughter of Mr. Carter, of Yew Cottage, near the former place.

The Rev. Thomas Richardson, of Bishophill, to Miss Mary Grainger, of the city of York.

DECEASED.

The Rev. John Heselton, Minister of the New Chapel, Morley, Yorkshire.

In his 80th year, the Rev. Joseph Bowman, upwards of 50 years Curate of Slaidburn, Yorkshire.

Aged 68, the Rev. Samuel Knight, M.A. Vicar of Halifax.—He was formerly Fellow of Magdalen College, Cambridge, and was nominated in 1798, the first Incumbent of the Holy Trinity Church, in Halifax, which he held till his appointment to the Vicarage on the decease of the Rev. Henry W. Coulthurst, D.D. in the year 1817.

The Rev. T. Balmforth, of Holmfirth, near Huddersfield, aged 66.



Aged 84, the Rev. James Rudd, D.D. Rector of Full Sutton, Yorkshire.

At Moreby, near York, the Rev. Tho. Preston.—He was an active Magistrate for the East Riding of York.

At Settle, the Rev. William Peart, only surviving son of John Peart, Esq.

Aged 30, the Rev. George Dales, of York.

The Rev. John Blanchard, Rector of Middleton, near Beverly, Yorkshire.

The Rev. M. Ogden, Perpetual Curate of Sowerby, near Halifax.

#### LONDON.

##### PREFERRED.

The Rev. Robert Firmin, B.A. of Clare Hall, Cambridge, to the Vicarage of Finchinghoe, Essex; Patron, his Father.

The Rev. Carew Anthony St. John Mildmay, M.A. of Oriol College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Chelmsford.

The Rev. Lord Frederick Beauclerk, M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, to the Vicarage of St. Michael, St. Albans.

##### ORDAINED.

March 11.

By the Lord Bishop.

##### DEACONS.

Richard Foster, B.A. St. John's College.  
Egerton Anthony Brydges, B.A. Trinity College.

##### MARRIED.

The Rev. William Winthrop, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, to Frances Mary, eldest daughter of the Rev. G. Feachem, Vicar of Dorking.

The Rev. Daniel Williams, B.D. Afternoon Lecturer of St. Bartholomew the Great, Smithfield, to Martha Blyth, eldest daughter of the late Rev. T. A. Dale, of Lewes, Sussex.

The Rev. Edward Osborn, M.A. of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, to Mary, second daughter of the late Henry Boland, Esq.

The Rev. Richard W. Allix, B.D. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Rector of Great Warley, Essex, to Jane, relict of the late Rev. George White, LL. B.

The Rev. R. Watkinson, late Second Master of the Charter House, to Miss Harby, of Caroline-place, Mecklenburgh-square.

The Rev. John Adeney, of Essex, to

Kitty Mary Jane, youngest daughter of the late Sir Thomas Carr, of Beddingham, Sussex.

The Rev. George Hodgson Thompson, M.A. to Georgiana, daughter of William Hobson, Esq. of Markfield, Stamford Hill.

At St. James's, Clerkenwell, by the Rev. D. Rewell, M.A. the Rev. G. S. Faught, to Anne, youngest daughter of Frederick Le Clerc, Esq. Cummin-street.

##### DECEASED.

The Rev. Charles Frederick Bond, M.A. Vicar of Margaretting, Essex, aged 62.

At Hampstead, the Rev. William Gilbank, in his 59th year.

The Rev. James Carpenter Gape, one of his Majesty's Chaplains in Ordinary, Rector of Croydon-cum-Clopton, Cambridgeshire, and Vicar of St. Michael's, St. Alban's, in the 73d year of his age.

The Rev. R. Johnson, aged 72, Rector of the Parishes of St. Antholin's and St. John Baptist.

#### DURHAM.

##### PREFERRED.

The Hon. and Rev. Dr. Wellesley, one of the Canons Residentiary of St. Paul's, to the Living of Bishop Wearmouth.

##### MARRIED.

The Rev. Henry Gunning, second son of the late Sir George Gunning, Bart. of Horton, Northamptonshire, to Mary Catharine, daughter of W. R. Cartwright, Esq. M.P.

##### DECEASED.

The Rev. Dr. Charles Henry Hall, Dean of Durham, on Friday, March 16, (owing to a violent accession of Fever, of no long duration,) at Edinburgh, whither he had gone with a view of consulting physicians, accompanied by his family.

Dr. Hall was elected a Westminster Student of Christ Church, Oxford, in 1779. In 1781 he was a successful Candidate for the Chancellor's Latin Verse Prize, "*Strages Indica Occidentalis*," and in 1784 he gained another Chancellor's Prize, the English Essay on "*The Use of Medals*." In 1793 he served the Office of Proctor, with Mr. Cartwright, of All Soul's College; in 1798 he preached the Bampton Lectures. In 1799 Dr. Hall succeeded Dr. Shafto as Canon of Christ Church; in 1807, on the promotion of Dr. Randolph to the Bishopric of London, he

was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity; and on the resignation of Dr. Jackson in 1809, he succeeded to the Deanery of Christ Church, which he resigned in 1824, when appointed Dean of Durham. He took the Degree of M.A. in January, 1786; B.D. 1794; and D.D. in 1800. He was in the 65th year of his age.—By the death of Dr. Hall, the Vicarage of Luton, in Bedfordshire, becomes vacant; Patron, the Marquis of Bute.

Dr. Hall married Anna Maria, the daughter of the late Lord Torrington, and sister of the present Viscount, in 1794, by whom he had several children, six of whom are living.

The Rev. Wm. Mack, Perpetual Curate of Egglestone, aged 77.

## WINCHESTER.

### PREFERRED.

The Rev. F. Swanton, to the Vicarage of Piddletrenthide, Dorset; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Winchester.

The Rev. Francis Swanton, to the Perpetual Curacy of St. John's Church, Winchester.

The Rev. J. B. Atkinson, M.A. to the Perpetual Curacy of West Cowes, in the Isle of Wight; Patron, the Rev. J. Breeks, Vicar of Carisbrooke, in right of his Vicarage.

### MARRIED.

The Rev. W. R. Bewsher, of Richmond, to Margaret, second daughter of the late E. Hawthorn, Esq.

The Rev. Henry Vallance, M.A. to Charlotte Channing, daughter of the late Rev. William Jarvis Abdy, M.A. Rector of St. John's, Southwark.

The Rev. James Duff Ward, M.A. of Trinity College, Oxford, fifth son of George Ward, Esq. of Northwood Park, Isle of Wight, to Harriet Marcia, eldest daughter of Henry Seymer, Esq. of Hanford.

The Rev. Francis Swanton, of Winchester, to Mary, only daughter of the late Rev. J. Brereton.

### DECEASED.

Aged 75, the Rev. David Middleton, Rector of Crux Easton, Hants.

At Yarmonth, the Rev. Starling Kelty, M.A. one of the Senior Fellows of King's College, Cambridge.

At Haslemere, Surrey, the Rev. James Parson.

NO. II.—APR. 1827.

## BANGOR.

### PREFERRED.

The Rev. Thomas Morgan, D.D. Chaplain of his Majesty's Dock Yard at Portsmouth, to the Vicarage of Llansadwra, with Llanwrda Chapel, in the County of Carnarvon; Patron, Admiral Sir Thomas Foley.

### ORDAINED.

At a special ordination held at the cathedral, on Thursday, the 25th January, by the Lord Bishop.

### DEACONS.

Peter Maurice, B. A. Jesus College Oxford.

### PRIESTS.

Henry Weir White, B.A. Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford.

Hugh Lloyd, B.A. Jesus College Oxford.

Hugh Wynne Jones, B.A. Jesus College, Cambridge.

William Price, B.A. Queen's College, Cambridge.

## BATH AND WELLS.

### PREFERRED.

The Rev. Loftus Anthony Cliffe, B.A. to the Vicarage of Sampford-Arundell, Somersetshire; Patron, W. Bellett, Esq.

The Rev. Henry Law, M.A. late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, to the Chancellorship of the Diocese of Bath and Wells; Patron, his father.

The Rev. Charles Edmund Keene, to the Prebendal Stall of Wiveliscombe, in the Cathedral Church; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

### MARRIED.

The Rev. W. H. Gardiner, of Barnstaple, to Mrs. Long.

The Rev. T. F. Newman, of Frome, Somersetshire, to Miss S. Bedford, Penisham, Worcestershire.

The Rev. J. C. J. Hoskyns Abrahall, M.A. Scholar of Wadham College, Oxford, and Master of Bruton Free Grammar School, to Jane, third daughter of Edward Dyne, Esq. solicitor, Bruton.

The Rev. Charles Ranken, M.A. Student of Christ Church, Oxford, to Isabella, daughter of Edward Long Fox, M.D. of Brislington House.

### DECEASED.

Aged 67, the Rev. Elias Taylor, B.D. of Trinity College, Oxford, and of Shoss-

N N

wick House, in the county of Somerset, and one of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace for that county.

# BRISTOL.

## PREFERRED.

The Rev. ROBERT GRAY, D.D. Prebendary of Durham, and Rector of Bishop Wearmouth, to be LORD BISHOP of this Diocese.

# CHESTER.

## PREFERRED.

The Rev. Charles Dodgson, M.A. Student of Christ Church, Oxford, to the augmented Curacy of Daresbury, in this Diocese; Patron, the Dean and Chapter of Christ Church.

The Rev. Thomas Lloyd Payne, M.A. of Brasenose College, Oxford, is appointed to the Curacy of St. Thomas's, Liverpool; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. W. Scoresby, F.R.S.L. and E.M.W.S. &c. Curate of Besingby and Carnaby, Yorkshire, to the Chaplaincy of the Mariner's Church at Liverpool.

The Rev. William Ainger, D.D. Superintendent of the Clerical Institution of St. Bees, Cumberland, to a Prebend in the Cathedral Church.

The Rev. J. Headlam, M.A. Rector of Wycliffe, Yorkshire, to be Archdeacon of Richmond.

## MARRIED.

The Rev. William Lockett, Curate of Davenham, to Mary, eldest daughter of the late R. L. Dudley, Esq. of Windsor Lodge, Cheshire.

The Rev. Charles Mytton, Rector of Eccleston, to Elizabeth, daughter of the late Hon. Booth Grey.

The Rev. Bertie Johnson, Rector of Lymne, Cheshire, to Isabel, second daughter of the late John Legh, Esq. of Booth's Hall, in the same county.

At the church of the Holy Trinity, Chester, by the Lord Bishop, the Rev. George Becher Blomfield, Rector of Tattenhall, in that county, to Frances Maria, third daughter of the Rev. R. Massie, of Stanley Place, Chester.

## DECEASED.

At Liverpool, aged 78, the Rev. James Page, formerly Curate of St. Peter's and St. Paul's, Bath.

The Rev. Thomas Trevor Trevor, D.C.L. of Christ Church, Oxford, and a Prebendary of Chester. He took his Degree of B. and D.C.L. in 1816.

At Horrook Hall, Lancashire, the Rev. Rigbye Rigbye, in his 77th year.

# CHICHESTER.

## PREFERRED.

The Rev. W. Wallinger, M.A. of University College, Oxford, to the Vicarage of Hellingly, Sussex; Patron, the Earl of Chichester.

The Rev. Hugh James Rose, M.A. Vicar of Horsham, Sussex, to a Prebendal Stall in the Cathedral Church; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. Thomas Baker, M.A. Christ College, Cambridge, to hold by Dispensation the Vicarage of Bexhill, with the Rectory of Bodmill, both in Sussex; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. Mr. Elliott, of Trinity College, Cambridge, appointed to the New Chapel of St. Mary's, Brighton.

The Rev. Thomas Agar Holland, B.A. of Worcester College, Oxford, to the Vicarage of Oving, Sussex; Patron, the Precentor of Chichester.

# ST. DAVID'S.

## MARRIED.

The Rev. Augustus Brigstocke, of Blakenpenna, Cardiganshire, M.A. and Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford, to Jane Ann Bridget, eldest daughter of D. Davies, Esq. M.D. of Pentre, Pembrokeshire.

The Rev. John Noble Coleman, M.A. late of Queen's College, Oxford, to Margaretta Eleonora Marella, youngest daughter of the late Rev. Daniel Evans, Rector of Llanvernach, Pembrokeshire.

The Rev. Amos Cryner, of Thornton, Pembrokeshire, to Miss Falconer, of Haverfordwest.

## DECEASED.

At Cardiff, after a long and painful illness, the Rev. Archer John Langley, M.A. Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford.

# ELY.

## PREFERRED.

The Rev. John Griffith, B.D. Curate of the Parish of St. Mary, in Ely, and late Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, to the Vicarage of Fulbourn, All Saints.

## MARRIED.

The Rev. H. Smith, M.A. Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, to Miss Morris, of Nottingham.

## DECEASED.

At Newton, near Wisbeach, the Rev. William Mair, aged 51, Vicar of Fulbourn, All Saints, Cambridgeshire.



**EXETER.**

**PREFERRED.**

The Rev. Samuel Rowe, B.A. of Jesus College, Cambridge, to the perpetual Curacy of St. Budeaux, near Plymouth; Patron, the Rev. John Hatchard, M.A. Vicar of St. Andrew's, Plymouth.

The Rev. William Swete, late of Oriel College, Oxford, to the Rectory of St. Leonard, Devon.

The Rev. Peter Glubb, Rector of Little Torrington, to the Living of Clandborough, in the County of Devon; Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

**MARRIED.**

At Bishop's Teignton, Devon, the Rev. John Wrey, of Oakhampton, to Ann Burnett, only daughter of the late Rev. Joseph Lane Yeomans, M.A. Vicar of Bishop's Teignton and Braunton, Devonshire.

**DECEASED.**

The Rev. W. Mitchell, rector of Corleigh and Barwick, Devon.

At Great Torrington, in his 75th year, the Rev. John Palmer, Prebendary of Lincoln, Rector of Clannaborough, Devon, and of South Benflete, Essex.

At Sidmouth, aged 24, the Rev. A. Blanchard, B.A. son of the Rev. J. Blanchard, Rector of Middleton, Yorkshire.

**GLOUCESTER.**

**MARRIED.**

The Rev. R. B. Holmes, of Gloucester, to Margaret, fourth daughter of the late S. Lassage, Esq. of Leeds.

**DECEASED.**

Aged 72, the Rev. Matthew Surtees, M.A. late Fellow of University College, Oxfordshire, and Rector of North Cerney, Gloucestershire, which Living is in the patronage of that Society. At the time of his death Mr. Surtees was Rector of Kirkby Underdale, Yorkshire, and Prebendary of Canterbury. He took the Degree of M.A. in 1780.

**HEREFORD.**

**MARRIED.**

At Hereford, the Rev. Allan Whitmore Lechmere, B.A. of Pembroke College, Oxford, to Maria Anne, only daughter of the late Thomas Cotes, Esq. M.D. of Abbey Dore.

**DECEASED.**

At Hereford, aged 32, the Rev. Henry Morse, eldest son of the late Mr. G. Morse, of Liddbrook.

At Landinabo, Herefordshire, in his 84th year, the Rev. J. Hoskins, Rector of that Parish, and Lecturer of Uxbridge.

**LICHFIELD AND COVENTRY.**

**PREFERRED.**

The Rev. William Edward Coldwell, M.A. Rector of St. Mary's, Stafford, to the Vicarage of Sandon, Staffordshire; Patron, the Earl of Harrowby.

The Rev. Mr. Franklin, Chief Grammar Master of Christ's Hospital, at Hertford, has been presented by the Governors to the Vicarage of Albrighton, in Shropshire.

The Rev. W. Vaughan, M.A. of Shrewsbury, and of St. John's College, Cambridge, to the Perpetual Curacy of Astley; Patrons, the Corporation of Shrewsbury.

**ORDAINED.**

By the Lord Bishop, in Wells Cathedral, on Sunday.

*January 27th.*

**DEACONS.**

Philip Arden Cooper, B.A. Oriel College, Oxford.

James Jackson, B.A. Brasenose College, Oxford.

Henry Dudley Ryder, B.A. Oriel College, Oxford.

George Arthur Smyth, B.A. St. Edmund Hall, Oxford.

Summerton Tudor, B.A. St. Edmund Hall, Oxford.

George Best Brown, B.A. Clare Hall, Cambridge.

Henry Arthur Herbert, B.A. Trinity College, Dublin.

James Lee, B.A. Trinity College, Dublin.

**PRIESTS.**

Samuel Fox, B.A. Pembroke College, Oxford.

Edward Power, Student of Magdalen Hall, Oxford.

James Thomas Campbell, B.A. Queen's College, Cambridge.

Samuel Broomhead Ward, B.A. Caius College, Cambridge.

*February 11.*

**DEACONS.**

John Kempthorne, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Francis Owen, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

MARRIED.

The Rev. Charles Williams, of Uffensline, to Miss Pyne, of Wellington.

The Rev. Thomas Browne, Vicar of Tideswell, Derbyshire, to Jane, third daughter of the late Mr Ollier, surgeon, of Manchester.

The Rev. Duncomb Steele Perkins, B.A. of Trinity College, Oxford, eldest son of Shirley Farmer Steele Perkins, Esq. of Sutton Coldfield, Warwickshire, to Ann, eldest daughter of Josiah Gist, Esq. of Wormington Grange, Gloucestershire.

The Rev. S. Connor, of Ockbrook, Derbyshire, to Sarah, second daughter of Mr. Ferris, Oxford.

DECEASED.

The Rev. George Bonney, 35 years Vicar of Sandon, Staffordshire.

Aged 70, the Rev. Thomas Lloyd, Vicar of Albrighton, Salop.

At Ashborne, the Rev. George Buckston, aged 74.

At Birmingham, in his 77th year, the Rev. J. Holden.

LLANDAFF.

MARRIED.

At Tiddenham, Gloucestershire, the Rev. James Davis, M.A. Vicar of Chipstow, to Henrietta Eliza, only daughter of the late Thomas Vores, of Welbeck-street, London.

LINCOLN.

PREFERRED.

The Right Rev. JOHN KAYE, D.D. LORD BISHOP of Bristol, Master of Christ College, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, to be LORD BISHOP of this Diocese.

The Rev. Robert Burnaby, B.A. to the New Church of St. George, Leicester.

The Rev. Robert Tweddell, M.A. to the Vicarage of Liddington with Caldecot, in Rutland.

The Rev. Mr. Lonsdale, Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to the Fellowship of Eton College, vacant by the death of the Rev. Dr. Foster Pigott.

The Rev. William Balfour Winning, M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, to the Vicarage of Keyshoe, Bedfordshire; Patrons, the Master and Fellows of that Society.

ORDAINED.

On Sunday, March 11, in Christ College Chapel, Cambridge, by the Lord Bishop.

DEACONS.

George William Brooks, B.A. Christ Church, Oxford.

William May Ellis, B.A. Christ Church, Oxford.

Henry Ven Hodge, B.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

George Davies Kent, M.A. Scholar of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

George Frederic Aphthorp, B.A. Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

John Blissard, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

John Chapman, B.A. Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.

William Grice, Queen's College, Cambridge.

Edward John Shepherd, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

George Thornton, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

John Ferdinando Wilkinson, B.A. Clare Hall, Cambridge.

Alexander Malcolm Wall, M.A. Fellow of St. John's, Cambridge.

John White, Queen's College, Cambridge.

FRIESTS.

Charles Beauchamp Cooper, B.A. University College, Oxford.

Thomas Middleton, B.A. St. Edmund Hall, Oxford.

Thomas Shepherd, B.A. Christ Church, Oxford.

Samuel Adams, B.A. Sydney Sussex College, Cambridge.

Gustavus Andrew Burnaby, B.A. Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

George Ellis, B. A. Catharine Hall, Cambridge.

John Fox, B.A. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

William Falcon, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

John Gaitskell, B.A. Sydney Sussex College, Cambridge.

Bernard Gilpin, B.A. Queen's College, Cambridge.

James David Glover, M.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

William Balfour Winning, M.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

MARRIED.

The Rev. John Balfour Magenis, Vicar

of Sharnbrook and Harold, Beds, to Frances Margaretta Ede, of Merry Oak, Southampton, second daughter of the Hon. Mr. Justice Moore, of Lamberton Park, Ireland.

The Rev. Thomas Pearse, Vicar of Harlington, and of Westoning, Beds, to Anna Letitia, daughter of George Aikin, Esq. of Harlington.

The Rev. W. Gray, of Totteridge, Herts, to Eleanor, youngest daughter of the late William Perry, Esq. of Whitehaven.

The Rev. Isham Case, M.A. Rector of Spingthorpe, Vicar of Merethingham, and Domestic Chaplain to the Duke of St. Alban's, to Catherine, eldest daughter of the Rev. M. Sheath, Rector of Wyberton.

The Rev. John Peacock Hyde, of Bengoe, Herts, to Emma, second daughter of Edward Robinson, Esq. of Havering Bower, Essex.

#### DECEASED.

On the 7th of February, at his Lordship's house, in Connaught-place, in consequence of a severe cold caught by attending the funeral of his Royal Highness the Duke of York, the Hon. and Right Rev. GEORGE PELHAM, Lord Bishop of this Diocese, D.C.L. in the 61st year of his age, after a few days illness. He was the youngest son of the late, and brother to the present Earl of Chichester. He was born on the 13th October, 1766, and married in 1792, Mary, daughter of Sir R. Rycroft. He was consecrated Bishop of Bristol, in the room of Dr. Cornwall, in 1803, translated to Exeter in the room of Dr. Fisher in 1807, and on Dr. Tomline being moved to the see of Winchester in 1820, his Lordship succeeded him in this Bishoprick. His Lordship was also Clerk of the Closet to the King, and Canon Residentiary of Chichester. His Lordship was a Member of the University of Cambridge.

At the Rectory House, Linwood, near Market Rasen, the Rev. Samuel Pycmont, M.A. in his 68th year. He was for 40 years Rector of that Parish.

The Rev. William Williams, Rector of Medbourn-cum-Holt, Leicestershire.

Aged 72, The Rev. Thomas Nelson, Vicar of Owersby, and of Kirkby-cum-Osgodby.

Aged 82, the Rev. William Harrison, M.A. Vicar of Winterton, and of Great Limber, both in Lincolnshire.

The Rev. John Swan, of Brant

Broughton, Vicar of Carlton-le-Moorland, and Sequestrator of Stapleford, aged 75.

At Aylesbury, aged 82, the Rev. W. Stockins.

#### NORWICH.

##### PREFERRED.

The Rev. C. R. Ashfield, B.A. to the Rectory of Blackenham, Suffolk; Patrons, the Provost and Fellows of Eton College.

The Rev. James Coyte, M.A. to the Perpetual Curacy of Farnham, Suffolk; Patron, Dudley Long North, Esq.

The Rev. Cremer Cremer, B.A. to the Rectory and Parish Church of Allmerton, with Runton near the Sea annexed, Norfolk; Patron, William Windham, Esq. of Felbrigg Hall, Rear Admiral of the Red; also to the Rectory of Felbrigg with Melton, by the said Admiral Windham.

The Rev. J. Blanchard, Jun. M.A. to the Vicarage of Lound, near Beverley; Patron, his Father, the Rev. J. Blanchard, Rector of Middleton, Yorkshire.

The Rev. Henry Dawson, to the Rectory of Hopton, Suffolk; Patron, the King.

The Rev. N. W. Hallward, M.A. to the Rectory of Milden, Suffolk.

The Rev. J. Hallward, M.A. to hold by Dispensation the Vicarage of Assington, Suffolk, with the Rectory of Easthope, Essex.

The Rev. Isaac Clark, to the Rectory of Dallinghoe, Suffolk; Patron, E. Moor, Esq. of Bealings.

##### MARRIED.

The Rev. E. J. Senkler, of Docking, Norfolk, to Eleanor Elizabeth, eldest daughter of the late Rev. W. Stevens, of Sedburgh, Yorkshire.

The Rev. Perry Nursey, B.A. Little Bealings, Suffolk, to Charlotte, youngest daughter of the late Rev. W. Prest Smith, formerly Rector of Waxham and Palling, in Norfolk.

The Rev. Edward Paske, Rector of Creting, St. Peter, and Battisford, Suffolk, to Helen Amelia, youngest daughter of the late Peter Gurley, Esq. of the island of St. Vincent.

##### DECEASED.

At Yarmouth, Norfolk, the Rev. J. T. Davies.

At Pickenham Hall, Norfolk, the Rev. Thomas Vere Chute.



At Framlingham, near Norwich, in the 71st year of his age, the Rev. J. Blanks.

At Fakenham, Suffolk, the Rev. Charles J. Smyth, aged 67, Rector of Fakenham, Vicar of Catton, Norfolk, and late one of the Minor Canons of the Cathedral Church of Norwich.

Aged 65, the Rev. Robert Carey Barnard, B.D. Rector of Withersfield, and one of the Magistrates for the county of Suffolk.

#### OXFORD.

##### PREFERRED.

The Rev. CHARLES LLOYD, D.D. Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University, to be LORD BISHOP of this Diocese.

The very Rev. the Dean and Chapter of Christ Church has been pleased to present the Rev. James Lupton, Chaplain, to the Vicarage of Black Bourton, in this county and diocese.

##### MARRIED.

The Rev. Charles Lee, fourth son of the Rev. T. T. Lee, Vicar of Thame, to Harrietta, eldest daughter of W. Browne, Esq. Waterloo, Northampton.

##### DECEASED.

On Saturday evening, the 27th January, in his 60th year, the Hon. and Right Rev. EDWARD LEGGE, Lord Bishop of this Diocese, and Warden of All Souls College, Oxford. His Lordship was the seventh son of William, second Earl of Dartmouth. He was educated at Rugby, and from thence became a member of Christ Church. In 1789 he was elected to a Fellowship in All Souls College, where he took the Degree of B.C.L. June 9, 1791; and that of D.C.L. April 6, 1805. Dr. Legge held for several years the Family Living of Lewisham, in Kent, together with the Deanery of Windsor; the former he resigned a few years since; the latter in 1815, when he was raised to this See, upon the demise of Bishop Jackson, and in 1817 he was elected Warden of All Souls.

At Charlbury, aged 82, the Rev. John Cobb, D.D. formerly Fellow of St. John's College, and Vicar of Charlbury in this county, which Living is in the patronage of the above Society. He was admitted Scholar of St. John's on the 25th of June, 1764; took his Degree of M.A. in 1772; B.D. in 1777; and D.D. in 1781. Dr. Cobb was many years a Magistrate for this county.

On Wednesday, the 24th January, at his Lodge, the Rev. Septimus Collinson, D.D. Provost of Queen's College, and Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University, Prebendary of Worcester, and Rector of Dowlish Wake and Dowlish West, Somersetshire, in his 88th year.—He took his Degree of M.A. in 1767; B.D. 1792; and D.D. in 1793. In 1778 he was presented to the Rectories above-mentioned, of which J. Hanning, Esq. is the Patron. In 1796 he succeeded Dr. Fothergill, as Provost of Queen's College, and in 1798 was elected Margaret Professor of Divinity in the room of Dr. Neve, of Merton College. Dr. Collinson was for some years one of the City Lecturers, but resigned in 1795.

Aged 58, the Rev. Nicholas Marshall Hacker, of Eustone, late Rector of Kidlington, in this county, and formerly Rector of Long Marston, in the county of Gloucester, which latter he resigned in the year 1808. He was of Worcester College.

#### PETERBOROUGH.

##### PREFERRED.

The Rev. T. S. Hughes, B.D. Christian Advocate, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop, to the Prebendal Stall in the Cathedral Church, vacated by the death of the Lord Bishop of Rochester.

#### ROCHESTER.

##### PREFERRED.

The Rev. Walker King, M.A. of Oriel College, Oxford, was appointed, by his late father, the Bishop of Rochester, to the Archdeaconry of that Diocese.

The Rev. M. Irving, B.D. to the Perpetual Curacy of Chatham; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Rochester.

##### DECEASED.

February 21.

On Thursday, at his residence at Wells, the Right Rev. Dr. WALKER KING, Lord Bishop of this Diocese, Senior Canon of Wells Cathedral, and Prebendary of Peterborough. Dr. King was of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and took his Degree of M.A. in 1775, and B. and D.D. in 1788. In the year 1808 he succeeded to this Bishopric, on Dr. Dampier's being promoted to that of Ely.

At Rochester, in the 88th year of his age, the Rev. Dr. Law, Archdeacon of Rochester, and Rector of Westmill, Herts, and of Easton Magna, Essex.

### SALISBURY.

#### PREFERRED.

The Rev. W. Roberts, to the Living of Clewer, near Windsor; Patrons, the Provost and Fellows of Eton.

The Rev. Lancelot Miles Halton, B.A. to the Rectory of Woolhampton, in the county of Berks; Patron, the Rev. Lancelot Greenthwait Halton, of Throxton, Hants, and Harriet his wife.

The Rev. John Edmeads, to the Rectory of St. Mary's, Cricklade, Wilts; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

#### MARRIED.

The Rev. R. B. Paul, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, and Vicar of Long Wittenham, Berks, to Rosa, daughter of the Rev. R. Twopenny, Rector of Little Casterton.

At St. Mary's, Bathwick, the Rev. G. Taunton, B.D. Rector of Stratford St. Anthony, Wilts, and late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, to Sarah, daughter of James Bradford, Esq. of Swindon.

#### DECEASED.

The Rev. Henry Hale, M.A. Rector of Orcheston St. Mary, Wilts, and formerly Fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge. The Rectory is in the Patronage of the Master and Fellows of that Society.

Aged 79, the Rev. William Foster Pigott, D.D. F.A.S. of Abingdon Pigotts, Cambridgeshire, Fellow of Eton College, Rector of Mereworth, Kent, and of Clewer, Berks, and one of his Majesty's Chaplains.

The Rev. Richard Hawkin Hitchins, B.D. Rector of Baverstock, in the county of Wilts, and some time Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. The Living is in the Patronage of that Society. M.A. 1789; B.D. 1799.

The Rev. Alexander Thislethwayte, youngest son of the Rev. Alexander Thislethwayte, of Norman Court, near Salisbury.

### WORCESTER.

#### PREFERRED.

The Hon. and Rev. Thomas Henry Coventry, M.A. to hold with the Rectory of Purton, with Croome d'Abitot annexed, the Rectory of Croome Montis, otherwise Hill Croome, by Dispensation under the

Great Seal; Patron, of the latter preferment, the Lord Chancellor.

The Rev. John Vernon, B. A. to the Rectory of Shrawley, Worcestershire; Patrons, the Executors of the late Thomas Shrawley Vernon, Esq.

The Rev. W. A. Hadow, M.A. to the Rectory of Hasely, in the County of Warwick; Patron, Sir Edmund Antrobus, Bart.

#### ORDAINED.

By the Lord Bishop, in the Chapel of his Lordship's Castle at Hartlebury.

*February 2.*

#### DEACONS.

Matthew Getley, B.A. Lincoln College, Oxford.

Arthur Whalley, B.A. Pembroke College, Oxford.

#### PRIESTS.

Charles Rodwell Roper, B.A. St. John's College, Oxford.

#### MARRIED.

The Rev. R. H. Amphlett, of New Hall, near Droitwich, to Jane, daughter of the late T. Dudley, Esq. of Shutt End, Staffordshire.

#### DECEASED.

In his 39th year, the Rev. Joshua Newby, Rector of Haseley, near Warwick.

In his 51st year, the Rev. H. P. Cooper, Vicar of All Saints' and St. Lawrence, Evesham, Worcestershire, and Perpetual Curate of Hampton, in the same county.

### CHAPLAINCIES, &c.

The Lord Bishop of Chichester to be Clerk of the Closet to the King, in the room of the late Bishop of Lincoln.

The Rev. John Hobart Seymour, M.A. of Exeter College, Oxford, and Vicar of Horley-cum-Hornton, in that county, to be Chaplain in Ordinary to the King.

The Rev. Charles Hall, M. A. of Scarbro', Yorkshire, to be one of the Domestic Chaplains to the Right Hon. Lord Macdonald.

The Rev. D. R. Curren, M.A. of Christ Church, Oxford, and of Clifton House, near York, to be one of the Domestic Chaplains to the Right Hon. Lord Viscount Downe.

The Rev. Sir Henry Thompson, Bart. M.A. of Oriel College, Oxford, to be Chaplain to George Collins Poore, Esq. High Sheriff of Hants.

The Rev. R. M. Boulton, B. D. of Merton College, Oxford, to be one of the Domestic Chaplains to the Right Hon. Lord Montagu.

The Rev. Joseph Fletcher, M.A. to be Domestic Chaplain to the Earl of Warwick.

The Rev. H. Parker and Rev. N. R. Dennis, both from the Half-pay, to be Chaplains to the Forces.

The Rev. John Harrison, of Duffield Bank, to be Chaplain to his Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex.

### SCHOOLS.

The Rev. John H. Coates Borwell, M. A. of Queen's College, Oxford, is licensed, by the Rev. Precentor Bartlam, to the Free and Endowed Grammar School of Plymouth.

The Rev. Arthur Whalley, B. A. of Pembroke College, Oxford, to the Head Mastership of the Free Grammar School at Kington, in the county of Hereford. Trustees, the Earl of Oxford and Earl Mortimer, the Bishop of Hereford, and Thomas Perry, Esq. of Eardisley Park.

### SCOTCH CHURCH.

The King has presented the Rev. P. Buchanan to the Church and Parishes of Stichell and Hume, Presbytery of Kelso, and counties of Berwick and Roxburgh.

The Rev. John M'Dougal to the Second Charge of the Parish of Cambleton.

The Rev. Julius Wood, M.A. to the Church of Newton-upon-Ayr, vacant by the death of the Rev. Dr. Peebles.

The Rev. David Aitken, to the Parish of Minto: Patron, the Earl of Minto.

### MARRIED.

#### IRELAND.

The Rev. Charles Smith, Prebendary of Howth, to Elizabeth, third daughter of the Archbishop of Dublin.

The Rev. W. Hutchinson, eldest son of T. Hutchinson, Esq. Bury, Lancashire, to Sarah, eldest daughter of Edw. Mitchell, Esq. of Castle Strange, Ireland.

The Rev. Allan Morgan, of New Ross, in the county of Wexford, to Margaret, youngest daughter of the late A. H. Bradley, Esq. of Gore Court, in the county of Kent.

January 1st, at Tipperary Church, the Rev. Benjamin Halford Banner, rector of Bansha, to Helene, widow of the late T. B. Buckworth, Esq.

#### SCOTLAND.

At Jardine Hall, Dumfries, the Rev. C. S. Hassells, M.A. of Trinity College, to Helen, only daughter of the late Sir Alexander Jardine, Bart. of Applegarth.

The Rev. J. C. Thomson, to Miss M. Johnson, of Berwick.

The Rev. Archibald Nisbett, of Glasgow, to Mrs. Campbell, of Ormaiz.

#### BARBADOS.

At St. George's Church, by the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Barbados, the Rev. Stephen Isaacson, B.A. of Christ College, Cambridge, Rector of St. Paul's, Demarara, to Anna Maria Miller Killikelly, youngest daughter of the late Bryan Bernard Killikelly, Esq. of the island of Barbados.—The Right Hon. the Earl of Huntingdon, his Excellency Sir Benjamin D'Urban, Lady D'Urban and Family, the Venerable the Archdeacon of Barbadoes, &c. &c. honoured the Ceremony by their presence. This being the first instance of a Protestant Bishop having performed any of the Offices of the Church on the vast Continent of South America, its novelty excited a considerable degree of interest, and attracted many persons to the spot.

### DECEASED.

In Nottingham, aged 42, the Rev. Tho. Adin, Rector of Charlotte Town, Prince Edward's Island, and Chaplain to His Majesty's Forces on that Station.

In the Island of Madeira, where he had gone for the benefit of his health, the Rev. C. M. Deighton, Vicar of Langhope, Gloucestershire.

#### IRELAND.

At Cloydagh, Glebe House, near Carlow, the Rev. Dr. Thomas, aged 75, for upwards of 40 years Rector of the Union of Cloydagh, and Prebendary of Shrule, in the Diocese of Leighlin.

In Dublin, Dr. Spray, Vicar Choral of St. Patrick's Cathedral, and formerly a Member of the Cathedral Choir of Lichfield.

#### SCOTLAND.

The Rev. Dr. Ranken, Minister of St. David's Church, Glasgow.



# PROCEEDINGS OF THE UNIVERSITIES. --- --- OXFORD.

DEGREES CONFERRED.—FROM JANUARY TO MARCH, INCLUSIVE.

## DOCTORS IN DIVINITY.

*March 16.*

Rev. John Fox, Provost of Queen's College.

Rev. George Chisholm, Worcester College.

## BACHELOR AND DOCTOR IN DIVINITY— (*by accumulation.*)

*February 8.*

Rev. John Cookesley, Exeter College.

## DOCTOR IN CIVIL LAW.

*February 22.*

Rev. Geo. Taylor, St. John's College.

## BACHELORS IN DIVINITY.

*February 1.*

Rev. Owen Owen, Fellow of Jesus College.

Rev. James Carne, Oriel College.

*February 8.*

Rev. Benjamin Saunders Claxon, Worcester College.

Rev. Edwin Prodders, Trinity College.

*March 15.*

Rev. John Fox, Provost of Queen's College.

Rev. John William King, Fellow of Corpus Christi College.

Rev. George Chisholm, Worcester College.

*March 16.*

Rev. Samuel Curlewis Lord, Wadham College.

*March 22.*

Rev. Henry Shrubb, Fellow of Corpus College.

## BACHELOR IN CIVIL LAW—

*(by commutation.)*

*February 15.*

Rev. George Taylor, M.A. St. John's College.

## MASTERS OF ARTS.

*January 15, being the first day of Lent Term.*

Hon. and Rev. Thomas Henry Coventry, Christ Church, grand compounder.

Edmund Frederick Carrington, Queen's College.

William Aislabie Eade, Balliol College.

Donald Maclean, Balliol College.

*February 1.*

Rev. Richard Mealy, St. John's College, grand compounder.

Rev. Edward Scobell, Magdalen Hall.  
William Bentinck Lethem Hawkins, Exeter College.

Rev. Edward Coleridge, Exeter College.

John Prideaux Lightfoot, Fellow of Exeter College.

*February 8.*

George Davies Kent, Scholar of Corpus Christi College.

Rev. Ernest Hawkins, Balliol College.

Rev. Charles Oakes, St. John's College.

Rev. Thomas Price, Exeter College.

*February 15.*

Rev. Robert Wynter, Jesus College.

George Henry Woods, Wadham College.

*February 22.*

Rev. James Daubeny, Brasenose College.

Rev. Joshua Reynolds Johnson, Balliol College.

*March 8.*

William Bilton, Christ Church, grand compounder.

Rev. Edward Griffith, Exeter College.

Rev. Henry Jones, Exeter College.

Rev. Thomas Byrth, Magdalen Hall.

Rev. Charles Tucker, Wadham College.

*March 15.*

William John Agg, Pembroke College, grand compounder.

Rev. Maximilian Geneste, Queen's College.

Rev. John Eddy, Trinity College.

Rev. Elisha William Hood, Wadham College.

Rev. Edward Woodhouse, Pembroke College.

George Trevelyan, Fellow of Merton College.

Edward Baldwin, St. John's College.

*March 22.*

Rev. Richard Bingham, Magdalen Hall.

Rev. Thomas Harman, Queen's College.

John Horndon, Exeter College.

## BACHELORS OF ARTS.

*February 1.*

John Henry Arnold Walsh, Balliol College, grand compounder.

John Whitmore Wall, Fellow of New College.

William Hale, Magdalen Hall.

Robert Isham, Brasenose College.  
 Richard Tarbutt, Brasenose College.  
 John Turner Colman Fawcett, Student  
 of Christ Church.  
 William James Easley Bennett, Student  
 of Christ Church.  
 Cecil William Page, Student of Christ  
 Church.  
 Kenrick William Collett, Christ Church.  
 William Annesley, University College.  
 Charles Robert Butler, Worcester Col-  
 lege.

*February 8.*

Thomas John Henning, Christ Church,  
 grand compounder.  
 Edward Cave, Brasenose College.  
 James Mackell, Brasenose College.  
 George Cary Elwes, Trinity College.  
 Patrick Murray Smythe, Christ Church.  
 John Gower, Magdalen College.  
 Samuel Beckwith, St. John's College.  
 Charles Nicoll, Exeter College.

*February 15.*

Charles Denham Orlando Jephson,  
 Brasenose College, grand compounder.  
 Thomas Gordon Penn, Christ Church.  
 James Clay, Balliol College.  
 John Day, Exeter College.

*February 22.*

Charles John Boyle, Fellow of All  
 Souls' College.  
 John Mitchinson Calvert, Oriel College.  
 John David Chambers, Oriel College.  
 Henry Beckley, Exeter College.

*March 8.*

Marcus Richard Southwell, Exeter  
 College, grand compounder.  
 Thomas Dawson Hudson, Exeter Col-  
 lege.

*March 15.*

William Drummond, Trinity College,  
 grand compounder.

*March 22.*

The Right Hon. Philip Henry, Viscount  
 Mahon, Christ Church.  
 Thomas Gladstone, Christ Church.  
 William John Blake, Christ Church.  
 Charles Dacres Bevan, Balliol College.  
 John Horne, Exeter College.

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Dr. Buckland, the Reader in Mineralogy  
 and Geology, has recently received a letter  
 from Rome, announcing that the writer,  
 Stephen Jarrett, Esq., Gentleman Com-  
 moner of Magdalen College, has purchased  
 a very valuable collection of marbles, &c.  
 in that city, for the purpose of presenting  
 them to this University. This collection  
 has been formed by an Advocate of Rome,  
 Signor Corsi, during a residence there of

many years, and consists of one thousand  
 polished pieces, all exactly of the same  
 size, of every variety of granite, sienite,  
 porphyry, serpentine, and jasper marble,  
 alabaster, &c. that is known to exist. The  
 size of each piece being that of a small  
 octavo volume, is sufficient to show the  
 effect *en masse* of each substance it con-  
 tains.

The Wardenship of All Souls' College,  
 in this University, having become vacant  
 by the death of the Hon. and Right Rev.  
 Edward Legge, Lord Bishop of Oxford,  
 the College elected the Rev. Lewis Sneyd,  
 M.A. Fellow of that Society, Rector of  
 Headley, in Surrey, and Chaplain to the  
 Earl of Plymouth, to be Warden; their  
 election has been confirmed by the nomi-  
 nation of his Grace the Archbishop of  
 Canterbury.

*January 29.*

The Election took place for a Margaret  
 Professor of Divinity, in the room of the  
 late Provost of Queen's, when the Rev.  
 Godfrey Faussett, B.D. late Fellow of  
 Magdalen College, was the successful  
 Candidate. The numbers were as follow :

The Rev. Dr. Nares, Merton College, Regius Professor of Modern History . . . . .	33
The Rev. Dr. Shuttleworth, Warden of New College . . .	19
The Rev. Godfrey Faussett, Magdalen College . . . . .	42
Total . . . . .	94

*February 1.*

The Rev. John Fox, M.A. Fellow of  
 Queen's College, was unanimously elected  
 Provost of that Society, in the room of  
 the late Rev. Septimus Collinson, D.D.

Same day Mr. Charles Lewis Cornish  
 was elected an Exhibitioner on Mr.  
 Michel's Foundation at Queen's College.

*February 13.*

The nomination of the Rev. Edward  
 Cardwell, B.D. as a Delegate of the Press,  
 in the room of the Hon. and Right Rev.  
 the late Bishop of Oxford, was unanimously  
 approved of in Convocation.

*February 16.*

Mr. Anthony Grant was admitted actual  
 Fellow of New College.

*February 18.*

Mr. Robert Evans, Scholar of Jesus  
 College, and Vinerian Scholar, was elected  
 Fellow of that Society.

*February 22.*

In full Congregation, Stephen Peter  
 Rigaud, Esq. M.A. late Fellow of Exeter

College, was admitted to the Professorship of Astronomy, on the foundation of Sir Henry Savile, vacant by the death of the late Abram Robertson, D. D. of Christ Church; and at the same time the Rev. Baden Powell, M.A. of Oriel College, was admitted to the Professorship of Geometry, vacated by Mr. Rigaud's acceptance of the Astronomical chair.

February 27.

In full convocation, the University Seal was affixed to Petitions to both Houses of Parliament, praying that the Laws by which Persons professing the Roman Catholic Religion are precluded from holding certain offices, and from sitting in Parliament, may not be repealed.

March 3.

Henry Griffith, B.A. of Jesus College, was admitted Scholar of that Society.

March 4.

Mr. Charles Wells was admitted actual Fellow of New College.

March 7.

The Proctors for the ensuing year were elected by their respective Societies, and their election announced to the Vice-Chancellor. The Proctors elect are, the Rev. Charles Thomas Longley, M.A. Student of Christ Church; and the Rev. Andrew Edwards, M.A. Fellow of Magdalen College.

March 10.

Mr. Newton Burton Young was admitted Actual Fellow of New College.

March 12.

Mr. Wm. Henry Newbolt was admitted Actual Fellow of New College.

March 17.

The Rev. George Davies, Kent, M.A. was admitted a Probationary Fellow of Corpus Christi College; and Mr. George Edward Deacon, of the county of Hants, Mr. Charles Balston, of the county of Kent, and Mr. Frederick Holme, of the county of Gloucester, were admitted Scholars of that Society.

March 20.

The nomination of Mr. Round, of Balliol College, and Mr. Thomas, of Pembroke College, as public Examiners in *Literis Humanioribus*, and of Mr. Saunders, of Christ Church, in *Disciplinis Mathematicis et Physicis*, were unanimously approved in Convocation.

March 22.

Mr. Travers Twiss, Commoner of University College, was elected a Scholar of that Society, on the Bennett foundation.

March 23.

Mr. Andrew Douglas Stacpoole, of New

College, was admitted an actual Fellow of that Society.

The Public Examiners, nominated in the room of those gentlemen who have continued in office for the period fixed by Statute, are,

IN LITERIS HUMANIORIBUS.

The Rev. James Thomas Round, M.A. Fellow of Balliol College.

The Rev. William Beach Thomas, M.A. Scholar of Pembroke College.

IN DISCIPLINIS MATHEMATICIS ET  
PHYSICIS.

The Rev. Augustus Page Saunders, M.A. Student of Christ Church.

The Examiners appointed by the Trustees of Dean Ireland's Foundation, were the Rev. Dr. Bull, Student of Christ Church, the Rev. Mr. Symons, Fellow of Wadham College, and the Rev. Mr. Keble, Fellow of Oriel College. The Examination for the Ireland Scholarship was holden in the Convocation House on Friday, March 23.—The Scholarship is open to all Under Graduates who have not exceeded their sixteenth term.

SUMMARY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE  
UNIVERSITY, JANUARY, 1827.

	Members of Con- vocation.	Members on the Books.
1 University . . .	113 . .	215
2 Balliol . . .	86 . .	223
3 Merton . . .	71 . .	127
4 Exeter . . .	94 . .	251
5 Oriel . . .	145 . .	233
6 Queen's . . .	142 . .	328
7 New . . .	72 . .	149
8 Lincoln . . .	58 . .	136
9 All Souls . . .	65 . .	90
10 Magdalen . . .	117 . .	163
11 Brasenose . . .	222 . .	404
12 Corpus . . .	73 . .	121
13 Christ Church . . .	418 . .	325
14 Trinity . . .	97 . .	233
15 St. John's . . .	129 . .	224
16 Jesus . . .	51 . .	177
17 Wadham . . .	72 . .	186
18 Pembroke . . .	68 . .	163
19 Worcester . . .	85 . .	225
20 St. Mary Hall . . .	33 . .	89
21 Magdalen Hall . . .	43 . .	153
22 New Inn Hall . . .	1 . .	1
23 St. Alban Hall . . .	12 . .	44
24 St. Edmund Hall . . .	45 . .	103
	<hr/> 2312	<hr/> 4923
Matriculations . . . . .		400
Regents . . . . .		182
Determining Bachelors in Lent . . .		256



# CAMBRIDGE.

## DEGREES CONFERRED FROM JANUARY TO MARCH, INCLUSIVE.

### BACHELORS IN DIVINITY.

March 7.

Robert George Suckling Browne, St. John's College.

Robert Ferrier Blake, Caius College.

### MASTERS OF ARTS.

February 7.

Rev. Thomas Earle Pipon, St. John's College.

March 7.

William Butt, Downing College.

Rev. Richard Swann Robin, Catharine Hall.

March 20.

Edw. St. Aubyn, Trinity College.

### BACHELORS IN CIVIL LAW.

March 7.

William Jackman, Trinity Hall.

John Phillips, Trinity Hall.

### BACHELORS OF ARTS.

February 7.

Lewis Garland, Trinity College.

Thomas Sikes, Queen's College.

February 28.

Henry Morris Cockshott, Trinity College.

William White, Trinity College.

Richard Tyacke, St. John's College.

Thomas Mills, Clare Hall.

William Tyrer, Catharine Hall.

Thomas Smith Howard, Emmanuel College.

March 7.

Henry H. Franklin, Corpus Christi College.

The Rev. John Merewether, M.A. of Queen's College, Oxford, and the Rev.

John Twycross, B.A. of Trinity College, Dublin, were admitted *ad eundem*.

## PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS.

The following is the List of Honours adjudged at the Examinations for Degrees, holden in the Senate House, January 20.

### WRANGLERS.

- |                         |                          |                           |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 Gordon, Peter's Coll. | 13 Stuart, Queen's Coll. | 24 Colville, John's Coll. |
| 2 Turner, Trin.         | 14 Moore, Qu.            | 25 Dodd, C. C. C.         |
| 3 Cleansby, Trin.       | 15 Hoare, Joh.           | 26 North, Joh.            |
| 4 De Morgan, Trin.      | 16 King, C. C. C.        | 27 Kempthorne, Joh.       |
| 5 Cankrien, Trin.       | 17 Biley, Clare.         | 28 Carus, Trin.           |
| 6 Yate, Joh.            | 18 Charlesworth, Trin.   | 29 Webster, Trin.         |
| 7 Hopkins, Pet.         | 19 Pinder, Cai.          | 30 Burnaby, Cai.          |
| 8 Butterton, Joh.       | 20 Cooper, Trin.         | 31 Dawes, Cai.            |
| 9 Tinklar, C. C. C.     | 21 Lewis, Trin.          | 32 Farre, Joh.            |
| 10 Thompson, Joh.       | 22 Kelly, Cai.           | 33 Dobbs, Trin.           |
| 11 Peacock, Joh.        | 23 Brooke, Joh.          | 34 Jarreth, Cath.         |
| 12 Venn, Qu.            |                          |                           |

### SENIOR OPTIMES.

- |                    |                      |                                 |
|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1 Hovenden, Trin.  | 13 Newland, C. C. C. | 25 Rees, Joh.                   |
| 2 Beechey, Cai.    | 14 Talbot, Trin.     | 26 Dewdney, Joh.                |
| 3 Eade, Cai.       | 15 Sanders, Pemb.    | 27 Walford, Trin.               |
| 4 Cumby, C. C. C.  | 16 Luard, Joh.       | 28 Kennedy, Joh.                |
| 5 Haslewood, Joh.  | 17 Barrs, jun. Joh.  | 29 Lay, Joh.                    |
| 6 Owen, Joh.       | 18 Stammers, Joh.    | 30 Dykes, } <i>aq.</i> C. C. C. |
| 7 Bunch, Emm.      | 19 Grose, Clare.     | 31 Sergeant } <i>Pet.</i>       |
| 8 Roswell, Sid.    | 20 Paull, Joh.       | 32 Johnson, Joh.                |
| 9 Colbeck, Emm.    | 21 Fosbrooke, Pemb.  | 33 Bowstead, Joh.               |
| 10 P. Smith, Trin. | 22 Deans, Chr.       | 34 Cooper, Pemb.                |
| 11 Cape, C. C. C.  | 23 Appleton, Trin.   | 35 Leatherdale, Joh.            |
| 12 Row, Cai.       | 24 Spyers, Joh.      |                                 |

### JUNIOR OPTIMES.

- |                      |                      |                    |
|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1 Cartwright, Chr.   | 8 Easton, Emm.       | 15 Vinall, Cath.   |
| 2 Collyer, Trin.     | 9 S. Smith, Trin.    | 16 Breynton, Magd. |
| 3 Kenrick, Trin.     | 10 Bernard, C. C. C. | 17 Braine, Trin.   |
| 4 Chatfield, Trin.   | 11 Willan, Pet.      | 18 Woodhouse, Sid. |
| 5 Cottingham, Clare. | 12 Antrobus, Joh.    | 19 Appleyard, Cai. |
| 6 Malins, Cai.       | 13 Barrs, sen. Joh.  | 20 Robson, Trin.   |
| 7 Stainforth, Qu.    | 14 Cartmel, Pemb.    |                    |

- |                               |                                 |                              |       |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|-------|
| 1 Jones, Cath.                | 62 Wales, Cath.                 | 123 Bond, C. C. C.           |       |
| 2 Hensley, Cath.              | 63 Cobbold, Cai.                | 124 Bull, }                  | Joh.  |
| 3 Groves, Chr.                | 64 Franklin, C. C. C.           | 125 Gilby, sen. } <i>aq.</i> | Clare |
| 4 Litchfield, Trin.           | 65 Jordan, Clare.               | 126 Singleton, Qu.           |       |
| 5 Woods, Emm.                 | 66 Willan, Chr.                 | 127 Woodley, Pet.            |       |
| 6 Whitmore, Trin.             | 67 A. Pearson, Trin.            | 128 Tyacke, Joh.             |       |
| 7 Blackwell, Cath.            | 68 Fonnereau, Trin.             | 129 Coke, Trin.              |       |
| 8 Gibson, Trin.               | 69 Henslow, Jes.                | 130 Yerbury, Trin.           |       |
| 9 Clarke, Qu.                 | 70 Sprowle, Jes.                | 131 Murray, Pet.             |       |
| 10 Waddington, Trin.          | 71 Soltau, Trin.                | 132 Garland, Trin.           |       |
| 11 Clements, Qu.              | 72 Berwick, } <i>aq.</i> Qu.    | 133 Rice, Trin.              |       |
| 12 Booth, } Qu.               | 73 Huyshe, } <i>aq.</i> Sid.    | 134 Boydell, Magd.           |       |
| 13 Cooper, } <i>aq.</i> Qu.   | 74 Offley, Joh.                 | 135 J. Davis, Joh.           |       |
| 14 Cotron, Pemb.              | 75 Martin, Trin.                | 136 Tooke, Trin.             |       |
| 15 Parker, Trin.              | 76 Smith, jun. Magd.            | 137 Woodward, Joh.           |       |
| 16 Owen, Magd.                | 77 Corset, } Trin.              | 138 Grice, Qu.               |       |
| 17 Jarvis, Pemb.              | 78 Hutt, } <i>aq.</i> Trin.     | 139 Wilson, Trin.            |       |
| 18 White, Qu.                 | 79 Watson, Trin.                | 140 Brett, Trin.             |       |
| 19 Hotchin, Cai.              | 80 Drummond, Trin.              | 141 Brewin, Trin.            |       |
| 20 Massingberd, Down.         | 81 Cockshott, Trin.             | 142 Gilby, jun. Trin.        |       |
| 21 Harrison, Chr.             | 82 Riddall, Chr.                | 143 Bloom, Cai.              |       |
| 22 Fitzherbert, Qu.           | 83 I. Pearson, Trin.            | 144 Burroughs, Joh.          |       |
| 23 Reeks, Clare.              | 84 Barwick, Magd.               | 145 Digby, Joh.              |       |
| 24 Livesay, Joh.              | 85 Sanders, Pet.                | 146 Clive, Joh.              |       |
| 25 Richardson, Chr.           | 86 Yule, Jes.                   | 147 Hare, Qu.                |       |
| 26 Beeson, Joh.               | 87 Beath, Joh.                  | 148 Rawlins, Trin.           |       |
| 27 Livesay, Clare.            | 88 Meech, Emm.                  | 149 Everett, Joh.            |       |
| 28 Shaw, Trin.                | 89 Nesfield, Jes.               | 150 Morse, C. C. C.          |       |
| 29 Prideaux, Trin.            | 90 Ridsdale, Pet.               | 151 White, Trin.             |       |
| 30 Phillips, Qu.              | 91 Delacour, Joh.               | 152 Myall, Cath.             |       |
| 31 Howarth, Cai.              | 92 Lyall, Chr.                  | 153 Maude, Jes.              |       |
| 32 Priaux, Cath.              | 93 Crompton, Trin.              | 154 Wymer, Joh.              |       |
| 33 Goodhart, Trin.            | 94 Browne, } Joh.               | 155 Wright, Trin.            |       |
| 34 Byron, Emm.                | 95 Tayleure, } <i>aq.</i> Trin. | 156 Smith, sen. Magd.        |       |
| 35 Russell, Cath.             | 96 Frankish, Joh.               | 157 Smyth, Tr. H.            |       |
| 36 Wallace, Trin.             | 97 Booth, Qu.                   | 158 Rawlins, Emm.            |       |
| 37 Pope, Trin.                | 98 Hooper, Emm.                 | 159 Macarthy, Pet.           |       |
| 38 Daniel, } Chr.             | 99 Emmett, Trin.                | 160 Cheere, Joh.             |       |
| 39 Rennie, } <i>aq.</i> Trin. | 100 Smith, Cath.                | 161 Marcus, Qu.              |       |
| 40 Atkinson, Trin.            | 101 Clay, Sid.                  | 162 Hoyle, Joh.              |       |
| 41 Holte, Trin.               | 102 Chell, sen. Joh.            | 163 Hutchins, C. C. C.       |       |
| 42 Grainger, Down.            | 103 Docker, Pemb.               | 164 Goodwin, Em.             |       |
| 43 Shackleton, Trin.          | 104 Hume, Joh.                  | 165 Packe, Chr.              |       |
| 44 T. T. Smyth, Qu.           | 105 E. H. Smith, Qu.            | 166 Gooden, Jes.             |       |
| 45 Marsden, Joh.              | 106 Ely, Joh.                   | 167 Inge, Trin.              |       |
| 46 Cam, Pemb.                 | 107 Lord Douro, Trin.           |                              |       |
| 47 Neeld, Trin.               | 108 Lake, Jes.                  | 168 Agar, Jes.               |       |
| 48 Seckerson, Cath.           | 109 Finch, Trin.                | 169 Biddulph, Clare.         |       |
| 49 Greig, Trin.               | 110 Lillingston, Emm.           | 170 Bowden, Qu.              |       |
| 50 Stephenson, Jes.           | 111 Prescott, Trin.             | 171 Chell, jun. Joh.         |       |
| 51 Smith, C. C. C.            | 112 Medlicott, } Qu.            | 172 Cheere, Qu.              |       |
| 52 Scott, Trin.               | 113 Tryon, } <i>aq.</i> Joh.    | 173 Cricklow, Trin.          |       |
| 53 Mead, Joh.                 | 114 Gwyther, Joh.               | 174 Darby, Down.             |       |
| 54 Hall, Trin.                | 115 Hey, C. C. C.               | 175 Dymocke, Trin.           |       |
| 55 Williams, Chr.             | 116 Cresswell, Joh.             | 176 Gibson, Jes.             |       |
| 56 Sikes, Qu.                 | 117 Gray, Trin.                 | 177 Greene, Jes.             |       |
| 57 Capper, Qu.                | 118 Addis, Trin.                | 178 Hartley, Chr.            |       |
| 58 Commins, Cath.             | 119 Franklin, Clare.            | 179 Hutchins, Jes.           |       |
| 59 Heathcote, Joh.            | 120 Latener, Jes.               | 180 Kitchin, Qu.             |       |
| 60 Steward, C. C. C.          | 121 York, Joh.                  | 181 Lawson, Sid.             |       |
| 61 Pultine, Trin.             | 122 Cheere, Joh.                | 182 Leach, Jes.              |       |

183 Ness, C. C. C.  
184 Powel, Pet.  
185 Pullen, Qu.

186 Scott, Pet.  
187 Spenser, Qu.  
188 Sprigge, Pet.

189 Stimson, Cai.  
190 Stopford, Trin.  
191 Strangways, Joh.

The Senior Wrangler is a Hat Fellow Commoner, and son of Sir Willoughby Gordon, Bart. Quarter Master-General. It is a circumstance almost unprecedented in this University, that a gentleman of Mr. Gordon's rank should obtain the highest mathematical honour of the year.

## THE BRACKETS.

Gordon, Pet.  
Cleasby, } Trin.  
Turner, }  
De Morgara, Trin.  
Butterton, Joh.  
Cankrien, Pet.  
Hopkins, Trin.  
Yate, John.

Jarrett, Cath.  
Kelly, Caius.  
Kempthorne, Joh.  
King, C. C. C.  
Lewis, Trin.  
North, Joh.  
Pinder, Caius.  
Webster, Trin.

Bunch, } Emm.  
Colbeck, }  
Cumby, C. C. C.  
Eade, Caius.  
Haslewood, } Joh.  
Owen, }  
Rowell, Sid.  
P. Smith, Trin.

Barrs, Joh.  
Cape, C. C. C.  
Deans, Chr.  
Fosbrooke, Pem.  
Grose, Clare.  
Luard, Joh.  
Newland, C. C. C.  
Paull, Joh.  
Rose, Caius.  
Saunders, Pemb.  
Stammers, Joh.  
Talbot, Trin.

Appleton, Trin.  
Bowstead, Joh.

Cooper, Pemb.  
Dewdney, Joh.  
Dykes, Pet.  
Johnson,  
Kennedy,  
Lay, } Joh.  
Leatherdale,  
Rees,  
Spyers,  
Serjeant, C. C. C.  
Walford, Trin.

Antrobus, Joh.  
Appleyard, Caius.  
Barrs, Joh.  
Bernard, C. C. C.  
Brane, Trin.  
Breynton, Magd.  
Cartmell, Pemb.  
Cartwright, Christ.  
Chatford, } Trin.  
Collyer, }  
Cottingham, Clare.  
Caston, Emin.  
Kenrick, Trin.  
Malins, Caius.  
Robson, } Trin.  
S. Smith, }  
Stainforth, Qu.  
Vinall, Cath.  
Willan, Pet.  
Woodhouse, Sid.

Hoare, Joh.  
Moore, Qu.  
Peacock, Joh.  
Stuart, Qu.  
Thompson, Joh.  
Tinklar, C. C. C.  
Venn, Qu.  
Beachey, Cai.  
Biley, Clare.  
Brooke, Joh.  
Burnaby, Caius.  
Carus, } Trin.  
Charlesworth, }  
Colvile, Joh.  
Cooper, Trin.  
Davies, Caius.  
Dobbs, Trin.  
Dodd, C. C. C.  
Farne, Joh.  
Hovenden, Trin.

W. G. Smith, Trinity College, Fenn, Trinity College, and Hill, St. John's College, who had passed their Examinations on a former occasion, were admitted Bachelors of Arts.

The following gentlemen were admitted to *Ægotat* Degrees :—

Helsam, C. C. C.  
Wilson, Cath.

Armitage, Trin.  
Cubitt, Caius.

Langton, Caius.  
Livingston, Joh.

## CLASSICAL TRIPOS, 1827.

## FIRST CLASS.

Ds. Kennedy, Joh.  
Hovenden, Trin.  
Butterton, Joh.  
Percy Smith, Trin.  
Chatfield, Trin.  
Hoare, Joh.  
Jarrett, Cath.  
Rees, Joh.  
Carus, Trin.

Ds. Talbot, Trin.  
Walford, Trin.  
Branie, Trin.  
Cleasby, Trin.  
Robson, Trin.

## SECOND CLASS.

Collyer, Trin.  
Appleyard, Caius.  
Appleton, Trin.

Ds. Vinall, Cath.  
Kempthorne, Joh.  
Peacock, Joh.

## THIRD CLASS.

Spyers, Joh.  
Willan, Pet.  
Charlesworth, Trin.  
Paull, Joh.  
Cottingham, Clare.



The Rev. Temple Chevallier, M.A. of Catharine Hall, has been re-appointed Hulsean Lecturer for the year 1827.

The Rev. Challis Paroissien, M. A. Fellow of Clare Hall, has been elected one of the Senior Fellows of that Society.

In conformity with the regulations passed by the Senate, March 13, 1822, notice has been given that the following are to be the subjects of examination in the last week of the Lent Term, 1828.

1. The Gospel of St. Mark.
2. Paley's Evidences of Christianity.
3. The First and Second Books of Xenophon's Memorabilia.
4. The Second Book of Horace's Epistles.

Lord Norreys, eldest son of the Earl of Abingdon, is admitted of Trinity College.

*January 26.*

Mr. Comyns Tucker, of St. Peter's College, was elected University Scholar on the foundation of Sir William Browne.

*February 7.*

At a Congregation this day a Grace passed the Senate, appointing the Rev. G. Skinner, of Jesus College, the Rev. J. Weller, of Emmanuel, and Mr. Platt, of Trinity, (who is deputy for the Regius Professor of Hebrew,) examiners of the Candidates for the Hebrew Scholarships.

At the same Congregation Richard Thomas Lowe, B.A. of Christ College, was elected Travelling Bachelor, on the nomination of the Master of that Society.

*February 13.*

The Master and Fellows of Peterhouse unanimously elected Henry Percy Gordon, Esq. (Senior Wrangler of the present year) Honorary Fellow of that Society.

*March 3.*

The Rev. Robert Andrews, M.A. and the Rev. Henry Fearon, B.A. of Emmanuel College, were elected Fellows on the foundation of that Society.

At the same Congregation, Graces to the following effect passed the Senate:—

To affix the University Seal to a letter intended to accompany the books presented by the University to the library of Bishop's College, Calcutta, and to another letter accompanied by a similar donation to the library of Lampeter College, Diocese of St. David's.

To allow a sum not exceeding £150 from the common chest for book-cases and cabinets to preserve the books, &c. under

the custody of Dr. Walker's reader at the Botanic Garden.

*March 10.*

James Prince Lee, of Trinity College, was elected University Scholar on Lord Craven's Foundation. The Examiners of the Candidates determined that Lofft, of King's, and Wordsworth, sen. of Trinity, should be re-examined.

*March 16.*

William Williamson, Esq. B.A. of Clare Hall, was elected a Foundation Fellow of that Society.

## PRIZES.

### SMITH'S PRIZES.

[Of £25 each to the best Proficients in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy among the commencing Bachelors of Arts.]

Adjudged as follows:—

First prize.—Ds. Turner, Trin. 2d wrangler.

Second prize.—Ds. Henry Percy Gordon, Pet. 1st wrangler.

### NORRISIAN PRIZE.

Subject.—“The Mosaic Dispensation not intended to be perpetual.”

Adjudged to

Francis White, Trinity College.

### TYRWHITT'S HEBREW SCHOLARSHIPS.

The Vice-Chancellor and the Official Electors of these Scholarships have given notice in pursuance of the 13th regulation of the Senate, bearing date the 14th March, 1826, that a Premium of £50 will be given for the best Dissertation

“On the Character and Authority of the Targum of Jonathan on the Prophecy of Isaiah, with a particular reference to those passages which relate to the Messiah.”

The Dissertations are to be in Latin, the Candidates must have taken their first degree, and the exercises are to be sent in (with motto and paper containing the author's name sealed up in the usual manner) to the Vice-Chancellor on or before the 1st day of December next.

### CHANCELLOR'S MEDALS.

[For the two best proficients in Clerical Learning among the Commencing Bachelors of Arts.]

Adjudged to

Benjamin Hall Kennedy, St. John's.

Valentine Fowler Hovenden, Trinity College.

### SEATONIAN PRIZE.

Subject for the present year,

“The Marriage at Cana in Galilee.”

## UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN.

The Vice-Chancellor's Prizes to Graduates have been adjudged to Messrs. Taylor, Smith, and O'Donohue; and for Undergraduates, to Messrs. Hardy, Pollock, Meredith, Boyle, and Crosthwaite.

The Berkeley Medals, for proficiency

in the Greek language, and regular attendance at the lecture of the Greek Professor for the last year, have been given to the following Bachelors:—George Sidney Smith and M'Caule.

---

## WESTMINSTER SCHOOL.

The names of the candidates examined on Wednesday, February 7, at Westminster School, for the writership given by Mr. Wynn, were Messrs. Fronde and Allen, King's Scholars; and Messrs. Davis, Escombe, Bailey, and Finlater, town boys. The examination, after continuing from ten o'clock till five, was adjourned. The subjects of examination for the day were the Greek and Latin

Classics, Geography and Roman History. The examiners were Dr. Batten, Principal of Halesbury College, and Mr. Tyler, Fellow of Oriel College, and Mr. Cramer, late Student of Christ Church, Oxford. These gentlemen, we understand, expressed themselves most favourably upon the performances of all the candidates. Mr. Wynn and many other gentlemen were present during the examination.

---

## ST. DAVID'S COLLEGE, LAMPETER.

The opening of this Institution, to which so much interest is attached, took place on the 1st of March; but, in consequence of the unavoidable absence of the Lord Bishop, it was not accompanied with any public ceremony. The Solemnities expected to be attendant on an

event, so proud to Wales, were therefore, in accordance with the wishes of the Governors of the College, deferred to a future opportunity, when the College Chapel will be consecrated with a ceremony befitting the sacred occasion.

---

# INDEX

OF THE

## REMARKABLE PASSAGES

IN THE

### CRITICISMS, EXTRACTS, ECCLESIASTICAL AND UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

#### A.

- Abbott* (Lord Chief Justice) argument and opinion of, on the validity of special resignation bonds, 531—534.  
*Annuities* to clergymen's widows, plan of a society for, 171—173—remarks thereon, 173, 174.  
*Antiquarian Researches*, fair estimate of, 25, 26.  
*Apparatus*, costly, not necessary for Museums, 193.  
*Archdeacon's* office, observations on, 425, 426.  
*Association* for discountenancing vice in Ireland, origin and establishment of, 17—its objects, 18—remarks on the success of its schools, 19.  
*Assyrian Monarchy*, remarks on the chronology of, 400—402—on the Assyrian expectations of a Deliverer, 447—460.

#### B

- Babylonian Monarchy*, remarks on the chronology of, 402—416.  
*Bailey* (Rev. B.) observations of, on the duty of an evangelist, 379.  
*Balaam*, observations on the history and character of, 451, 452—and on his prophecy, 452—460.  
*Baptism*, administration of, in private, remarks on, 427, 428—importance of the public celebration of, 428.  
*Baptismal regeneration*, observations on, 112, 113.  
*Battle of Pavia*, 388.

VOL. I.—1827.

*Baïter* (Richard) liberal conduct of, towards Mr. (afterwards) Archbishop Sharpe, 324.

*Bedouins*, manners of, 365—367, 368.

*Benjamin*, typical coincidence between the history of the birth of, and of that of Christ's nativity, 346, 347.

*Berens* (Rev. Edward) observations of, on the duty of the clergy to visit their parishioners, 212.

*Blomfield* (Rt. Rev. C. J. Bishop of Ctes-ter) tribute of, to the characters and memories of Bishops Middleton and Heber, 494—496.

*Blunt* (Rev. Henry) extract from a funeral sermon by, 99, 100—remarks thereon, 100, 101.

*Boleyn* (Anne) address of, 393—nature of the charges against her, 394—summary of the evidence for and against her, 395, 396.

*Bonds of Resignation* (special,) argument of Mr. Justice Gaslee, on the legality of, 495—509—of Mr. Baron Hullock, 509—531—of Lord Chief Justice Abbot, 531—534.

*Bourbon* (Constable) intrigues of, with Henry VIII. 387.

*Bower* (Archibald) character of, 124.

*Brougham* (Mr.) remarks on the bill of, for extending national education, 1—observations of, on the utility of cheap publications for the people, 185—strictures on his exclusion of religion, 186—194, 195—on economy of philosophical apparatus, 193, 194.

*Burnet's* (Bishop) character of Archbishop Sharpe, 324.

O O



*Butler* (Rev. Dr.) important information communicated by, relative to the present state of the Church Establishment in the Archdeaconry of Derby, 95, 96—on the education of the lower orders, 97, 98.

## C.

*Cairo*, population of, 371—literary institutions there, *ib.*

*Cambridge University*, proceedings of, 269—273. 548—551—number of members of, 272.

*Campbell* (Dr.) observations of, on demoniacal possessions, 67, note.

*Carlos* (Don) character of, 136—antipathy of, to his father, *ib.*—steps taken to make him confess, 137, 139—his death, 139.

*Carpenter* (William) instances of his plagiarisms from Mr. Horne's Introduction to the Scriptures, 102—109—and from Dr. Adam Clarke's Commentary, 106, 107.

*Catechizing*, remarks on the disuse of, 429.

*Celts*, reasons for concluding that Italy was first peopled by, 33—38.

*Champollion* (M.) propositions established by, relating to the hieroglyphics of the Egyptians, 142—Forms of the signs by which the Egyptians expressed their ideas, 143—style of their execution, 144—number of really differing hieroglyphic characters, 145—classes under which they may be distributed, *ib.*—different kinds of symbols, *ib.* 146—why some phonetic hieroglyphics were used in preference to others, 148—explanation of a passage of Clemens Alexandrinus, relative to the epistolographic, hieratic and hieroglyphic writing of the Egyptians, 149, 150—use of the different kinds of hieroglyphics, 151—particularly of the epistolographic or demotic, and hieratic, 152—obligations of M. Champollion to the previous researches of Dr. Young, 153, 154—results of M. Champollion's researches, 155, 156—names of the Pharaohs, ascertained by him, 156—158—chronological data, illustrating certain dynasties of Egyptian kings mentioned by Manetho, 159—161.

*Christenings* in private, censured, 427—importance of solemnizing them publicly, 428.

*Christian Knowledge*, Society for promoting, memorial of, to the Directors of the East India Company, for augment-

ing the number of Bishops in India, 241—243—line of conduct pursued by the society and its missionaries, 244.

*Church of England*, encouraging prospects of, 170—Archbishop Sharpe's opinion of, 332—prospects of, 438—440—Law proceedings relative to the church, 497—534.

*Church of Rome*, fundamental distinction between, and those who differ from her, 485, 486.

*Clergy*, observations on the duties of, 167—particularly, visiting their parishioners, 212—in what manner they should perform the occasional offices, 168—the societies belonging to the Church of England particularly recommended to them, 169—plan of Diocesan Societies for securing annuities to their widows, 171—174—affecting appeal in behalf of the clergy, 217, 218—laborious duties of, 433, 434—address to, on the subject of field sports, 434, 435—437—importance and sacredness of their calling, 438, on their obligations, 439, 440—arguments of the judges on the legality of special bonds of resignation, 497—534.

*Climate of Italy*, changes wrought in, 52, 53.

*Commissioners for Education in Ireland*, remarks on the selection of, 2—9, and on their interpretation of the act of 28 Henry VIII., which enjoins the clergy to keep parochial schools, 15, 16—their charges against the Incorporated Society refuted, 5, 6—system of education recommended by them for Ireland, 21, 22—remarks thereon, 23—25.

*Conformity*, on the limits of, 360.

*Copleston* (Rev. Dr.) plan of his sermon on Nov. 5th, 483—on the conformity of the worship of the Church of Rome to the Jewish ritual, 484—fundamental distinction between the Church of Rome and those who differ from her, 485, 486—excellent advice, suited to the present day, 486, 487—on the little authority due to the declarations of some Roman Catholics, disavowing the opinions with which they are charged as a body, 487, 488.

*Copts* or descendants of the ancient Egyptians, notice of, 370, 371.

*Coustos* (John) sufferings of, in the Inquisition, 123.

*Cramer* (Rev. J. A.) importance of his illustrations of Livy, 27—29—correctness of his Map of Italy, 28, 29—remarks on his opinion that the first set-

tlers of Italy and Greece were of the same race, 33, 34—his account of the manner in which the Pelagic adventurers overspread Italy, 42, 43—on the decline and ruin of the power of the Tuscans, 45—on the uncertainty of the early history of Rome, 45, 46—on the changes wrought in the climate and temperature of Italy, 52, 53.

## D.

*Davy* (Sir Humphrey) opinion of, on the destruction of Herculaneum, 54, 55.

*Deaths*, happy, observations on, 339.

*Deliverer*, observations on the Assyrian expectations of, 452—460.

*Demoniacal possessions*, mentioned in the New Testament, reality of, 66, 67, note.

*Derby* (Archdeaconry of) state of the Church establishment in, 95—97.

*Dillon* (Rev. R. C.) the historiographer of the Lord Mayor's visit to Oxford, 474—his description of their departure, 475—arrival at Oxford, and reception by the Mayor, 476, 477—his account of the dinner given by the Lord Mayor, 478, 479—the return described, 479, 480—the chaplain's concluding reflections, 481.

*Dioceses*, state of, in England and Wales, 250—261. 535—543.

*Dissent*, appeal of a clergyman to his parishioners on, 216.

*Douglas* (Bishop) vindicated from the charge of falsely translating an authority cited by him, 492, 493.

*Drummond* (Sir William) analysis of his observations on the chronology of the Assyrian monarchy, with remarks, 400 402—and of the Babylonian monarchy, 402—416—his account of the supposed site of Nineveh, 417, 418—observations on it, 418—421.

*Dublin University*, proceedings of, 274—279. 552.

*Dynasties* of the Egyptian kings, mentioned by Manetho, illustrations of, 159—161.

## E.

*Education* in Ireland, account of the different societies for;—the Incorporated Society, 2—6; the Association for discountenancing Vice, 17—19; the Kildare-Street Institution, 20—System of education proposed by the Irish Education Commissioners, 21, 22—remarks

thereon, 22—25—importance of religious education to the poor, 97, 98.

*Edward VI.* and Queen Mary, poetical contrast between, 469, 470.

*Egyptians*. See *Hieroglyphics*.

*Elmsley* (Rev. Dr.) character of, 281, 282—particularly of his labours in classical literature, 282—rules followed by him in editing his Greek plays, *ib.* 283—notice of the different editions of Greek plays published by him, 283—the *Acharnenses* of Aristophanes, *ib.*—the *Oedipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles, 284—286—the *Heraclidæ* of Euripides, 284—the *Medea*, 285—*Bacchæ*, *ib.*—the *Oedipus Coloneus* of Sophocles, 286—remarks on Herman's review of his critical labours, 287, and of Dr. Elmsley's critical works, 288, 289—his opinion of Herman as a critic, 289, 290—account of his edition of the Roman Scholia upon Sophocles, 293—295—critical use which may be made of this edition, 296—299—passages of Sophocles which he proposed to correct, 319, 320.

*Epigram* on the Inquisition, 127.

*Episcopacy*, importance of, in India, 238.

*Episcopal Church* in Scotland, present state of, 375, 376.

*Establishment* (ecclesiastical) character of, 6, 7—its claims to support, 8.

*Euripides*, critical notice of Dr. Elmsley's editions of the *Heraclidæ*, *Medea*, and *Bacchæ* of, 284, 285.

*Evangelist*, duties of, 379.

## F.

*Farmer's* (Mr.) treatise on miracles, error of, refuted, 62—68.

*Fletcher*, Lord Sondes *versus*, arguments in the case of, 495—534.

*Forster's* (Rev. Charles) successful refutation of Simon's interpretation of Gen. xx. 340—344—analysis of his critical Essay on Matt. ii. 17, 18, 344—347—remarks thereon, 347, 348.

*Francis I.*, capture of, at the battle of Pavia, 388.

## G.

*Garbett* (Rev. John) Vindication by, of Bishop Douglas, from the charge of false translation, 492, 493.

*Gaselee* (Mr. Justice) argument and opinion of, respecting the validity of special resignation bonds, 495—509.

Gaza, present state of, 373.  
 Geddes (Rev. Mr.) account of the Inquisition in Portugal, 120—was himself summoned before it, *ib.*  
 Grey (Sir Charles) tribute of, to Bishop Heber's character and labours, 239.

## H.

Hale (Rev. W. H.) plan recommended by, for forming Diocesan Societies, for securing annuities to the widows of clergymen, 171—173—remarks thereon, 173, 174.

Heber (Rt. Rev. Reginald, Bishop of Calcutta) reflections on his nomination to India, 221, 222—sacrifices made by him, in accepting that appointment, 223—extracts from his farewell address to his parishioners, 223—225—from his sermon at the consecration of the church at Secrole, 227—229—his kindness to the Bishop of the Syrian Christians, 230—apostolical letter from him to the Bishop, 231—233—sketch of Dr. Heber's episcopal labours, 233, 234—notice of his death from the Calcutta Government Gazette, 234, 235—account of his conduct in India, by one of his chaplains, 236, 237—devotedness of the Bishop to his office, 238, 239—tribute to his memory by the Bishop of Chester, 495, 496.

Henry VIII. chivalrous pastimes of, 383—385—intrigues of the Constable Bourbon with him, 387—address of Anne Boleyn to him, 393—poetical character of, 468.

Herculeum, theory concerning the destruction of, 54—remarks thereon, *ib.* 55—57, and when the catastrophe happened, 58.

Herman (Professor) Dr. Elmsley's opinion of as a critic, 289, 290—his severe criticisms on Dr. Elmsley accounted for, 290—his just appreciation of Dr. Elmsley's character, *ib.*

Hieroglyphics (Egyptian) six propositions relating to, established by M. Champollion, 142—forms of the signs used by the Egyptians to express their ideas, 143—style in which they are executed, 144—number of hieroglyphic characters which are really different, and under what classes they may be distributed, 145—different kinds of symbols, *ib.* 146—why some phonetic hieroglyphics were used in preference to others, 148—passage from Clemens Alexandrinus, rela-

tive to the epistolographic, hieratic and hieroglyphic writing of the Egyptians, 149, 150—explanation of it, 150—use of the different kinds of hieroglyphics, 151—especially of the epistolographic or demotic, and hieratic, 152—obligations of M. Champollion to the previous hieroglyphic researches of Dr. Young, 153, 154—results of M. Champollion's labours, 155, 156—names of the Pharaohs, ascertained by him, 156—158—chronological data, illustrating certain dynasties of Egyptian kings mentioned by Manetho, 159—161.

Horne's (Rev. T. H.) Introduction to the Scriptures, order, &c. of, plagiarised, 102—109.

Hullock (Mr. Baron) argument and opinion of, respecting the validity of special resignation bonds, 509—531.

## I.

Imagination, effects of too frequent appeals to, in the Church of Rome, 213, 214.

India, beneficial effects of episcopacy in, 238—240—memorial of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge to the Directors of the East India Company, for augmenting the number of Bishops, 241—243—importance of the blending of religious persons and influence in India, 243—spiritual wants of India, 244—245.

Incorporated Society for promoting Education among the Irish Poor, design and institution of, 2, 3—charged with negligence, 4—the charge refuted, *ib.* 5—charged with cruelty, 5—the charge disproved, *ib.* 6—its masters vindicated from the charge of corruption, 6.

Inquisition in Spain, notice of early histories of, 119—122—124—126—sufferings of William Lithgow in, 122—of Isaac Martin, 123—of John Coustos, *ib.* epigram on the inquisitors, 127—qualifications of Señor Llorente, for writing his History of the Inquisition, 127, 128—atrocious cruelty practised in 1820, 129—crimes cognizable by this horrid tribunal, 120, 130—treatment of suspected Hebrew converts, 130—mode of proceeding of the Inquisition, 131, 132—anecdotes of remarkable victims of this tribunal, 133—the physician Torralva, *ib.* 134—Juan Perez de Saavedra, 135—Don Carlos, 136—139—Diaz, Bishop elect of Avila, 139—



Donna Aquila, 140—suppression of the Inquisition by Buonaparte, *ib.*—revival of it by Ferdinand, *ib.*—number of victims sacrificed by the Inquisition, *ib.*  
*Instruction*, remarks on the modern systems of, 179. See *Education*, *Mechanics' Institutes*, *London University*.  
*Ireland*, account of the various societies in, for educating the poor, 2—the Incorporated Society, 2—6—the Association for discountenancing Vice, 17—19—the Kildare Street Institution, 20,  
*Italy*, first peopled by the Celts and from the North-East, 33—38, and afterwards by the Pelasgi, 39—42—letters, when introduced, 44—Magna Græcia, when and by whom colonized, 49, 50—changes wrought in the climate of, 52, 53.

## J.

*Jacob's* dream, remarks on, 227, 228.  
*Jerram* (Rev. Charles) candid acknowledgment by, of his error, and change of sentiment on the subject of baptismal regeneration, 111—his view of scripture testimony on this subject, 112, 113—observations of, on repentance and faith, 114, 115—remarks thereon, 115—117, and on some of his statements respecting a peculiar style of preaching, 118.  
*Jerusalem*, population of, 373.  
*Jolly* (Rt. Rev. Bishop Alexander) observations of, on regeneration, 375.  
*Jortin* (Dr.) observations of, on demoniacal possessions, 67, note.

## K.

*Kildare Street* (Dublin) Institution, observations on, 20.

## L.

*Latitudinarianism*, importance of guarding against, 24.  
*Lay-Baptism*, Archbishop Sharpe's opinion of, 333.  
*Letters*, knowledge of, when introduced into Italy, 44.  
*Life*, pleasing illustration of, 223, 224.  
*Limborch's* History of the Inquisition, character of, 121.  
*Lingard's* (Dr.) History of England, character of, 380—his misrepresentation of the character of Anne Boleyn, 393.

*Lippi* (Signor) theory of, respecting the destruction of Pompeii and Herculæum, 54.

*Lithgow* (William) sufferings of, in the Inquisition, 122.

*Llorente* (Señor) qualifications of, for writing a history of the Inquisition, 127, 128—his account of the treatment of Jews, who were secretly Christians, 130—of the adventures of the physician Torralva, 133, 134.

*London* (Rt. Rev. Wm. Lord Bishop of) admirable observations by, on the revival and present state of the Roman Catholic controversy, 163—166—on the duties of the clergy, 167—the proper manner of performing the occasional offices, 168—the Bishop unjustly arraigned as the enemy of education, 169—recommendation of charitable institutions, immediately in connexion with the Church of England, *ib.*—on the favourable prospects of the Church, 170.

*London University*, account of projects of instruction which preceded it, 188, 189—its institution, 190—remarks on its defects, *ib.*—particularly the total exclusion of religion, 191—194—examination of the assertion that the sciences may be taught equally well, without reference to theology, 195—197—examination of the course proposed in the London University, 198, 199—evil of separating religion from human knowledge, 200, 201—absence of intellectual or moral discipline, 202, 203—little to be expected from it, 204.

*Lord Mayor's* visit to Oxford, account of, 475—480.

*Low* (Rt. Rev. Bp. David) observations of, on the Episcopal Church in Scotland, 375, 376—his complaint of intrusive clergymen from England, 377.

*Lowe* (Rev. T. H.) remarks of, on Dr. Milner's garbling of passages cited by him from the Fathers, 490, 491.

*Lux Renata*, extracts from, 468—471, 472—character of Henry VIII. *ib.*—contrast between Edward VI. and Mary, 469, 470—character of his style, 473.

## M.

*Magna Græcia*, when and by whom peopled, 49, 50—paucity of architectural remains there, 51.

*Mahometans*, objections of, to the evidence of miracles, 79—on what ground they satisfy themselves of the pretensions of

Mahommed, 80—their notions about magic, 81, 82—suggestion as to the best mode of contending with, 83.

*Manetho's* dynasties of certain Egyptian kings, illustrations of, 129—161.

*Manuscripts* of Sophocles, account of the most ancient, in various parts of Europe, 301—305.

*Martin* (Isaac) sufferings of, in the Inquisition, 123.

*Mary I.* and Edward VI., poetical contrast between, 469, 470.

*Mechanics' Institutes*, advantages of, 179—evils attendant on them, 180—account of the rise, progress, and tendency of the Mechanics' Institute of the metropolis, 181—184—remarks on the exclusion of morality and theology from its course of instruction, 184.

*Merewether* (Rev. Francis) address of, to his parishioners, on dissent, 216.

*Middleton* (Bishop) tribute to the memory of, 495.

*Miller* (Rev. Dr.) observations of, on the history of the plea of tradition, made by the Romish Church, 93, 94.

*Milman* (Rev. H. H.) observations of, on the effects of too frequent appeals to the imagination in the Church of Rome, 213, 214—and on the requisites of a sermon, 214, 215.

*Milner* (Dr. John) character of his 'End of Religious Controversy,' 489—convicted of garbling quotations from the Fathers, 490, 491—refutation of his charge against Bishop Douglas, of falsely translating one of his authorities, 492, 493.

*Miracles*, error of Mr. Farmer's treatise on, examined and refuted, 62—69—preliminary principles laid down by Mr. Penrose, 69—examination of a supposed case of similar miracles, wrought by persons of opposite pretensions, 70, 71—refutation of the charge that Christians produce doctrines in proof of miracles, 72, 73—the propriety of miracles as a credential of a divine teacher, 74—character of the scripture witnesses for miracles, 86—and of the miracles wrought by Moses and Jesus Christ, 87—observations on the miraculous frustration of Julian's attempt to rebuild the Jewish temple, 87, 88—strength of evidence of scripture miracles, 89, 90—remarks on the claims upon our attention, of alleged miracles not recorded in scripture, 100, 101.

*Missionary*, difficulties of, in contending with Mahometans, 79—82.

*Monk* (Very Rev. Dean) appeal of, in behalf of the clergy, 217, 218.

*Moses*, facts recorded by, how preserved by tradition, 445, 446.

## N.

*Nineveh*, observations on the site of, 417—422.

*Nolan* (Rev. Frederick) analysis of his work on the Assyrian expectations of a deliverer, 444—state of the question before his work appeared, 446—abstract of his statement that the Sethites are the same as the Sabæans, 447, 448 remarks thereon, 448, 449—and on his opinion that the prophecy of Enoch was known to the Sabæans, 449, 450—his account of Balaam, 451, 452—his translation of Balaam's prophecy, 452—remarks thereon, 453—460—and on his etymology and interpretation of the word Nebo, 460—463.

## O.

*Omnipresence* of the Deity, reflections on, 229.

*Oxford University*, proceedings of, 264—268. 544—547—number of its members, 268.

## P.

*Pæstum*, silence of ancient writers concerning, 51—total demolition of, *ib.* 52—observations on the celebrated roses of Pæstum, 52, 53.

*Patteson* (Rev. Edw.) extracts from the sermons of, on self-examination, 359, 360—on the limits of conformity, 360, 361.

*Pavia*, battle of, 388.

*Pelasgi*, reasons for concluding that Italy was peopled by, subsequently to the Celts, 39—42—notice of their settlements, 42, 43.

*Pendulum*, death inflicted by, in the Inquisition, 129.

*Penrose* (Rev. John) principles established by, for conducting an inquirer through the difficulties incident to many cases of miraculous attestation, 69—illustration of them, 70, 71—remarks of, on the hold which scripture miracles take on the mind, from the probability of its doctrines, 75—on the proper criterion of scripture miracles, 76, 77—on

the character of the witnesses for the scripture miracles, 86, 87—on Julian's attempt to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, 87, 88—commendation of his treatise on miracles, 92.

*Petrifactions* in Egypt, notice of, 369, 370.  
*Pharaohs*, names of, ascertained by M. Champollion, 156—158.

*Piazza's* (H. B.) account of the Inquisition, character of, 125—anecdote related by him, *ib.* 126.

*Pole* (Cardinal) proofs of the treasons committed by, 397, 398—his testimony entitled to little credit, 391, 392.

*Pompeii*, theory concerning the destruction of, 54—remarks thereon, 55—57—when the catastrophe took place, 58.

*Population* of Cairo, 370—of Jerusalem, 375.

*Psalmody*, importance of, 430, 431—remarks on the manner in which it is performed in some churches, 431, 432.

*Publications* (foreign theological) list of, 279, 280.

## R.

*Regeneration* (baptismal) doctrine of scripture on, 112, 113.

*Religion*, remarks on the exclusion of from the course of study in the new London University, 191—199—evils of separating religion from human knowledge, 200, 201.

*Repentance and Faith*, observations on, 114—117.

*Robinson* (Rev. Thomas) extracts from the funeral sermon of, on Bishop Heber, 235—237.

*Roman Catholic* controversy, observations on the revival and present state of, 163—166—little authority to be attached to the unauthorized declarations of some Roman Catholics, disclaiming opinions charged upon them as a body, 487, 488.

*Rome*, remarks on the uncertainty of the early history of, 45—scepticism of some modern historians considered, 46—source of its early history, 47—silence of early Greek writers concerning, 48, 49.

*Romish Church*, origin and progress of her plea of tradition, 93, 94—effects produced in, by too frequent appeals to the imagination, 213, 214.

*Rose* (Rev. H. J.) opinion of, concerning the tendency of the prevalent opinions about knowledge, how far supported by facts, 177, 178—superiority of moral science to physical, 205—in what re-

spects he has pushed his sentiments too far, 206—210.

*Roses* of Pæstum, notice of, 52.

*Ruins*, ancient, notices of, between Abusir and Agaba, 366—of Parætonium, 367—of the temple of Jupiter Ammon, 368, 369.

*Rural Deans*, importance of, 427.

## S.

*Saavedra* (Juan Perez) adventures of, 135.

*St. David's* College, notice of, 273, 552.

*Sarpi's* (Paolo) History of the Inquisition, character of, 121.

*Sermon*, requisites of, 214, 215—extracts from Bishop Heber's farewell sermon, 223—225—from his sermon on the omnipresence of the Deity, 227—229.

*Scholz* (Dr.) outline of the biblical travels of, 362, 363—his observations on the indiscreet liberality of some Englishmen, 364—on the natural history of the countries visited by him, 365—on the manners of the Bedouins, 365—367, 368—ruins between Abusir and Agaba, 366—ancient inscription near Sterrir, *ib.*—ruins of the ancient Parætonium, 367—on the ruins of the temple of Jupiter Ammon, 368, 369—traffic of the modern inhabitants of Siwa, 369—account of some petrifications, 369, 370—population of Cairo, 370—present state of the Copts, *ib.*—371—literary institution of the Dare' l' bakmet, at Cairo, 371—caves on Mount Carmel, 372—present state of Gaza, *ib.*—373—population of Jerusalem, 373.

*Scotland*, present state of the Episcopal Church in, 375, 376—intrusion of some English clergymen in, 377.

*Self-examination*, duty of, 359, 360.

*Shakspeare*, reading of, recommended by Archbishop Sharpe, 323.

*Sharpe* (Dr. John, Archbishop of York) birth and education of, 321, 322—is ordained, 323—his marriage, *ib.*—character, as rector of St. Giles's, 324—care, in composing his sermons, *ib.*—appointed Dean of Norwich, 325—remarks on the address, drawn up by him for the Grand Jury of the city of London, 325—appointed Dean of Canterbury, 326—raised to the see of York, *ib.*—his impartiality in bestowing prebends, 327—his opinion of the societies for reformation of manners, 329, 330—noble and disinterested conduct in public life, 330, 331—share in promoting



- the grant of Queen Anne's bounty, 332—his opinion of the Church of England, *ib.*—on lay-baptism, 333—generous interference in behalf of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, 334—also of the Vaudois, *ib.*—simplicity of his private character, 335—conversational talents, *ib.*—charity, 336—retired devotion, 337—his death, 338.
- Simon's* (Father) interpretation of Gen. xx. refuted, 340—344.
- Siwa*, notice of the modern inhabitants of 369.
- Sondes* (Lord) v. Fletcher, arguments and opinions in the case of, 495—534.
- Sophocles*, account of the Roman Scholia upon, 291, 292—and of Dr. Elmsley's edition of them, 293—295—examples of the use which may be made of his edition, 296—299—critical notice of his editions of the *Œdipus Tyrannus*, 284—286—of the *Œdipus Coloneus*, 286—of the Oxford edition of *Sophocles*, 299, 300—318—account of the most ancient manuscripts of *Sophocles*, at Florence, 301, 302—at Rome, 302, 303—at Naples and Paris, 303—in England, 304—in Germany, *ib.*—at Moscow, 305—classification of the editions of *Sophocles*, 306—318—passages of *Sophocles*, which Dr. Elmsley proposed to correct, 319, 320.
- Symbols*, different kinds of, used by the Egyptians, 149, 150.
- Syriac Christians* of St. Thomas, at Travancore, notice of, 230—hospitable reception, by Bishop Heber, of their bishop, Mar Athanasius, 231—apostolical letter of Bishop Heber to him, *ib.*—232.
- T.**
- Texts illustrated* :
- |                       |               |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| Gen. xviii. 18,       | 455, 456.     |
| — xviii. 21, 22,      | 456.          |
| — xx.                 | 340—344.      |
| — xxxv. 16—19,        | 345.          |
| — xlix. 10.           | 462.          |
| Exod. xxiv. 4,        | 456.          |
| Numb. xxiv. 17, 453,  | 454. 457—459. |
| Josh. iv. 5, xxiv. 6, | 456.          |
| Isa. xlvi. 1,         | 460, 461.     |
| Jer. xxxi. 16—19.     | 345.          |
| Matt. ii. 16, 17,     | 345, 347.     |
- Tiberias*, notice of, 373.
- Torrvalva* (Dr. Eugene) adventures of, in the Inquisition, 133, 134.
- Tradition*, origin and progress of the plea of, set up by the Romish Church, 93.
- Turner* (Sharon) plan of, in his History of Henry VIII. 380, 381—remarks on it, 381, 382—his account of the chivalrous pastimes of that king, 383—385—on the intrigues of the constable Bourbon, 387—account of the battle of Pavia, and the capture of Francis, King of France, 388, 389—remarks on the testimony of Cardinal Pole, 391, 392—his treasons, 397, 398—anecdote of Anne Boleyn, 393—nature of the charges against her, 394—summary of the evidence for and against her, 395, 396—strictures on Mr. Turner's panegyric of Henry VIII. 398.
- Tuscans*, decline of the ancient power of, 45.
- Tyrrheni*, progress of, in Italy, 42, 43.
- U.**
- Universities*, proceedings of:—Oxford, 264—263. 544—547—Cambridge, 269—273. 548—551—St. David's College, Cardiganshire, 273. 552—University of Dublin, 274—279.—See *London University*.
- V.**
- Vaughan* (Rev. Edward) analysis of his sermon on the rights of Cæsar and God, 350—specimens of his biblical criticisms, 351—curious extracts from his sermon, on rendering unto Cæsar, 351—353—on rendering to God, 354—and on the connexion between rendering to Cæsar and to God, 355—356 specimen of his sublimity, 356, 357.
- Volcanic eruption* that destroyed Herculæum, examination of, 54—57—date of the catastrophe, 58—traditionary account of the volcanic eruptions of Vesuvius, 59.
- W.**
- Westminster School*, notice of examination at, 552.
- Widows of Clergymen*, plan of Diocesan Societies for securing Annuities to, 171—173—remarks thereon, 173, 174.
- Wolsey* (Cardinal) character of 385, 386.
- Y.**
- Young* (Dr.) obligations of M. Champollion to the hieroglyphic discoveries of, 153, 154.















